00084714

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh
FOUNDATION

An Initiative by
HDFC
WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 15 October, 2018

Historic Towns

EDITED BY

EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L. & Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A.

LONDON

W-d-
X-e-37.

HISTORIC TOWNS.

EDITED BY

EDWARD A. FREEMAN, D.C.L.

Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford,

AND THE

Rev. WILLIAM HUNT, M.A. of Trinity College, Oxford.

Crown 8vo. price 3*s.* 6*d.* each.

THE towns to be treated in these volumes will, as far as possible, be selected with reference to the special part each played in the general history of the kingdom. There are for instance the old Roman cities, restored in some cases after a period of ruin, and the old head-towns of shires, some the same as the Roman cities, others different. There are towns, like Bristol in one age and Hull in another, which, without being heads of shires, rose to importance through commerce. There are again towns which gathered round a castle, an abbey, or a bishop's see, as Windsor and Pontefract, St. Edmundsbury and Evesham, Wells and Lichfield. There are lastly towns which, from small importance in earlier times, have risen to greatness within the last two centuries, and have outstripped all the rest, with the single exception of London itself. And within these several classes, each of the greater towns has its special place in English history, derived from some distinctive character of its own. York, once imperial, then royal, has kept more than any other city the character of a local capital on to our own day. Exeter is the city which, as not becoming English till Christian times, has lived the most uninterrupted life, Roman, British, and English, while it has largely shared with York the character of an abiding local capital. Winchester is pre-eminently the city of both English and Norman royalty. Carlisle is pre-eminently the abiding bulwark against the Scot, as Shrewsbury is against the Briton. Lincoln is the city of the Danish patriciate, for a long time the chief seat of intercourse with Northern Europe. The Cinque Ports, as a kind of armed confederation, connect the commercial and the naval history of England, and represent intercourse with France and the neighbouring lands. Oxford, standing on the borders of two ancient kingdoms, naturally became a favourite meeting-place for the kingdom into which the two were merged, and was, for the same reason, the fitting seat of an University. Coventry is remarkable as the only

one among the towns clustering round castles and churches which rose to much importance in other days. Among those towns whose importance is more modern, and which have outstripped their elders, there is a difference of character between Birmingham, whose greatness is wholly modern, Liverpool, which has a long municipal and parliamentary history, and Manchester, which though rising to first-rate importance only in later days, has a history which goes back to the very earliest times. The object of this series, in dealing with such towns and groups of towns as may be chosen for illustration, will be mainly to bring out the general historic position of each. The purely local history of each place, municipal and ecclesiastical, while not neglected, will be dealt with chiefly as it throws light on its general position. It is hoped that the series may in this way serve at once to clothe local objects and events with greater and more intelligent interest, by showing their connexion with the general history of the country, and on the other hand to throw light on the general history of the country itself which is so largely made up of the history of its several towns and districts.

The volumes will be printed in crown 8vo. and will contain about 224 pages. Maps and plans will be given where necessary.

LONDON	By Rev. W. J. Loftie.	[*Ready.*
EXETER	By E. A. Freeman, D.C.L.	[*Nearly ready.*
BRISTOL	By Rev. W. Hunt.	[*Nearly ready.*

IN PREPARATION.

CARLISLE	By Rev. Mandell Creighton.
CHESTER	By J. P. Earwaker.
CINQUE PORTS ...	By Montagu Burrows.
COLCHESTER	By Rev. E. L. Cutts.
LINCOLN	By Rev. Edmund Venables.
NORWICH	By Aug. Jessopp, D.D.
OXFORD	By Rev. C. W. Boase.
ST. ANDREWS	By Andrew Lang.
WINCHESTER	By G. W. Kitchin, D.D.
YORK	By Rev. James Raine.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.

Frontispiece.

LONDON ABOUT 1300.

London: Longmans & Co.

113

Historic Towns

LONDON

8 4714

BY

W. J. LOFTIE

B.A., F.S.A.

Author of 'A History of London' &c.



LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

X. C. 37

LONDON

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1887

All rights reserved

914.21
Lof/His
84714

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

PREFACE.

THE following pages do not profess to contain a complete history of London, or even of the City of London by itself. My object has been rather to apply to the more obscure parts of London history the discoveries which have recently been made, and to show the importance and, indeed, the interest of municipal history as it may be studied in the greatest city of the world. Much that is difficult and puzzling in other English towns may be resolved by a reference to the principles on which the constitution of London has been moulded; and at the same time there are points to be noticed which are wholly peculiar—as, for example, the grants of Middlesex and Southwark, the great extension of the suburbs and of trade, and the predominating power of the livery companies. Until lately so little was known or could be learnt as to the growth of the corporation that its origin was attributed to foreign influence, and even to the Romans. I have therefore tried in as brief a sketch as possible to trace the present municipality to its

germ in the universal English system, modified in name rather than in fact by the close connection which always subsisted with the neighbouring coasts of Germany, Flanders, and France.

I have endeavoured to acknowledge the authorities chiefly consulted in their places, and in so small a treatise on so great a subject have inserted no footnotes or appendix of original documents. The reader who wishes to search further into the questions here started should consult, before all other books, the Ninth Report of the Historical MSS. Commission, where he will find Mr. Maxwell Lyte's Calendar of the Documents of St. Paul's; and the Report of the Commission appointed in 1854 to inquire into the State of the Corporation. Applying to the evidence detailed in these Blue Books the knowledge of the laws and history of England to be derived from the works of the great constitutional historians, the student will have little difficulty in separating the wheat from the chaff; and it is my fervent hope that, before long, the history of London, in spite of all that has been written about it, will be as easily understood as the history of any other town.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

LONDON BEFORE ALFRED.

PAGE

Geographical Situation—Celtic Name—Roman Roads—Fort—Ptolemy and London in Cantium—The Watling Street—The Bridge—The Wall—The Gates—Destruction of Roman London—The Middle Saxons and East Saxons—Foundation of Modern London by Alfred 1

CHAPTER II.

THE PORTREEVES.

Alfred's Settlement—The Roman Lines abandoned—The Government—First mention of the Bridge—Local Names—Personal Names—Portreeves—Accuracy of Stow's List—The Norman Conquest—The Charter of William—The state of Trade—Aldermen before 1115—The Tower—The Charter of Henry I.—The Guild—The Portsoken—The Great Families—Orgar le Prude—The Canons of Aldgate—Prosperity of London under Henry I.—Stephen—The great Fire—Henry II.—John and Longchamp—The Commune acknowledged—The Mayoralty—A City Worthy 18

CHAPTER III.

THE MAYORS.

PAGE

Date of the Mayoralty—The Sheriffs—William FitzOsbert—The first Common Council—The early Guilds—Localisation of Trades—Growth and strength of the Commune—The succession of Mayors—Waning Influence of the Great Families—The descendants of FitzAilwin—Simon de Montfort and FitzThomas—Oppression of London by Henry III.—Walter Hervey—His Charters—Condition of London at the return of Edward I. 41

CHAPTER IV.

THE WARDENS.

The office of Warden—Sir Ralph Sandwich—City Improvements—The Gates—Lists of Wards—New Families—The Hundred Rolls—The Wards divided—Their early History and first recorded Aldermen—The Jews in London—The Warden of the City a Judge 68

CHAPTER V.

THE MUNICIPALITY.

The Municipality complete—The Civic Offices—Their Origin traced—The Lord Mayor—The Chamberlain—The Coroner—The Recorder—London under Edward II.—The Accession of Edward III.—Southwark granted—The first Chartered Companies—The Livery—Recapitulation—The Municipality not of Roman but of English origin 102

CHAPTER VI.

LONDON AND MIDDLESEX.

Suburbs—The Grant of Middlesex—The Estates of the Church—The Domesday Survey—Settlement of Essex and Middlesex

PAGE

—Sheriffs of Middlesex—London Landowners, T.R.E.—Albert the Lotharingian—Alwin—Deorman of London—Wards Without—The Prebends of St. Paul's—Emancipation of Serfs — Westminster— Tyburn— Kensington—Chelsea—Finsbury—Jurisdiction of the Sheriffs—Southwark—Bridge Without 120

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH IN LONDON.

St. Paul's—Bishop Erkenwald—British Church—the Diocese—The Canons—Parishes—Church-building in the Twelfth Century—Dedications—Early Parochial Divisions—View of London before the Reformation—The Religious Houses—Chantries—Wren's Churches 149

CHAPTER VIII.

LONDON TRADE.

The Growth of Suburbs attributable to Trade—Early Security of London—The Port—Foreigners in London—Teutonic Element—Normans and Germans—French Trade—Supremacy of London—Its Influence—The Control of the Thames—The Guilds and Trades—Modern Isolation of the City . . 173

CHAPTER IX.

LONDON AND THE KINGDOM.

The Place of London in English History—The Election of Kings—Mr. Green's account of the Election of Stephen—Mr Thorold Rogers on the Influence of London—Mr. Freeman on the Rights of London—Meetings of the Witan in London—The First Election of an English King in London—The Lithsmen' at Oxford—Later London Elections—The last Witenagemot—The Story of the Revolution in

PAGE

London—Lord Mayor Chapman—The Arrest of Jeffreys—Political Effect of Chapman's illness—The Grant of a Loan to William—Definition of the Place of London in the Events of 1688—London compared with Paris—Scope and Limitation of this Book—Summary—The End 190

INDEX 215

MAPS.

LONDON ABOUT THE YEAR 1300 . . . . . *Frontispiece*

ROMAN LONDON . . . . . *To face page* 16

THE WARD OF CASTLE BAYNARD . . . . . „ 80

LONDON.

CHAPTER I.

LONDON BEFORE ALFRED.

Geographical Situation—Celtic Name—Roman Roads—Fort—Ptolemy and London in Cantium—The Watling Street—The Bridge—The Wall—The Gates—Destruction of Roman London—The Middle Saxons and East Saxons—Foundation of Modern London by Alfred.

THE greatness of London is partly owing to its geographical situation and partly to its political freedom. Neither by itself would be sufficient to account for its early and lasting prosperity. Bristol was for centuries almost, if not quite, as well situated. Plymouth still enjoys exceptional facilities for the cultivation of foreign trade. But London, though such kings as Henry III. or Charles II. occasionally interfered with her freedom, was always able to compete successfully with cities where a lord of Berkeley or a prior of Plympton could fetter enterprise and tax profits. London had no overlord but the King, and may be described as 'a free imperial city,' a city which bore rule over its own subject district and was not itself

controlled by any external power. We may perhaps reckon Southampton or Liverpool to be equally well placed, we may find York or Winchester of earlier importance, but London has distanced all rivals in the race for fame and wealth, and rises, without peer, above the cities of England and of the world.

Geographically speaking, London stands at the confluence of the rivers Lea and Thames, about sixty miles from the open sea. The site is marked by a little stream, the Wallbrook, which afforded a natural harbour. On one side of it was the British village, or fort, which gave its name to our great modern city. The Romans, who habitually avoided British sites, built their station on the opposite or eastern bank of the brook. Some slight indications of the Celtic period have been traced on the western bank, but the most tangible relic of the British period is to be found in the name Llyn-Din, the lake-fort. Two objections have been urged to this interpretation. The first is philological, the second topographical. It has been laid down that to put the qualifying word or adjective before the noun is contrary to Celtic usage. This is true, especially of the later Celtic dialects, but no language stands still, and the existence of other names of the kind is sufficient to set it aside. The employment of the exceptional form, so far from telling against its true British origin, goes rather to prove its great antiquity. There are similar names of probable, if not certain, Celtic origin in the neighbourhood of London; but we may go further afield and select two examples, one from Scotland and one from Ireland, partly on account of their undoubted antiquity and

partly because they are well known everywhere. The district of Morven is so-called from Ben More, which stands within its boundaries. The Phœnix Park near Dublin is so-called from a well of clear water, Fain-Usk, which was in one of its lawns. There is then no antecedent philological objection to this interpretation of London. The geographical objection equally fails if we endeavour to view the site as it appeared to the Britons and Romans of the first century. In Dio's account of the campaign of Aulus Plautius in A.D. 50, a place is described which exactly answers to it. The Britons flying before the Romans withdrew 'to the river Thames whence it empties itself into the ocean, and at flow of tide forms a lake.' Here we have the tidal lake on which the fort looked, and when we remember that until a much later period the Thames spread itself at every flood over a wide space on its southern shores opposite to London, where, even now, there are places below the level of high water; when we remember further the inflow of the Fleet to the westward, and the wide estuary of the Lea, which then covered all the Isle of Dogs, we can readily understand the appropriateness of the description.

The Roman fort, in the opinion of Dr. Guest, was founded by Aulus Plautius in the autumn of 43. Its site has been thoroughly examined within the past few years. It stood above the Wallbrook, its western wing being exactly where Cannon Street terminus stands now, and its eastern reaching to Mincing Lane, so as to cover the approaches to a bridge which there seems no reason to doubt was very speedily built in order to

join the Watling Street, the road from Wroxeter, perhaps from Chester, to the road from Dover. The road from the bridge ran northward in a line with Botolph Lane, and joined the road to Colchester and Lincoln, afterwards known as the Ermin Street. At the junction of the two main roads was the market-place now indicated by the name of East Cheap; and as Roman roads seldom or never issued from a gate at right angles to the adjacent wall—as may very plainly be seen at such a place as Pompeii—we find both the Watling and the Ermin Streets going off as if at a tangent when they have passed out. The chief buildings were at the south-western corner overlooking the Wallbrook, close to the celebrated 'London Stone,' which may have marked the beginning of the first mile on the Watling Street. Here was probably the residence and court of the governor, and here not long ago a pavement and other remains were found which indicated the importance of the position. Another pavement at a lower level has also been found near what was the south-east corner of the pretorium, and has been thought to mark the place of a public bath. It is still preserved in the vaults of the Corn Exchange in Mincing Lane.

This is nearly all we know of Roman London in its early condition, and even this condition may not have been reached till after the revolt of Boadicea. Already however London, according to Tacitus, was the resort of merchants, though Suetonius did not consider it a place of military importance.

A disputed point may be noticed here: it will be desirable to examine a statement made by Ptolemy

the geographer, whose extraordinary accuracy is not to be lightly doubted. He sets London in Cantium, that is, on the south side of the Thames, where Southwark is now. Without speculating too much, we may account for this assertion by remembering that, until much later than his time, the Roman settlement on the northern bank consisted of very little more than the small fort or pretorium already mentioned, and the ring of open suburbs, filled, as he probably reckoned, with barbarians who were not worth considering. Moreover, there have always been very extensive Roman remains found in Southwark, although I do not think they have ever received scientific attention. The situation was one of great importance. It commanded the approach from Canterbury and Dover and the Continent to the bridge, and was marked out, and half fortified by, the embankments on which the southern road was carried through the marshes and lagoons to the hills of Kent. It is very possible, and indeed probable, that at the time Ptolemy wrote the fortifications of Southwark were considerably larger than those of London, which, as we shall presently see, owed a short-lived importance to one of the very last of the great works carried out in Britain by the Romans. If 'Wall-Worth' means the farm by the wall, and thus shows how far south its line extended, and if, as seems likely, its circuit was completed before the building of the greater London wall on the opposite bank, it certainly cannot well be assigned to the few years of decline and decay before the Romans left the island; Ptolemy is therefore right, and London until the end of the third century was a city in Cantium with an outlying fort and bridge-head on the opposite side of the

Thames. This is much more likely than that Ptolemy made any mistake.

Another disputed point relates to the course of the Watling Street. Dr. Guest could only account for it by supposing a circuit was made to avoid the great Middlesex forests, a theory which does not explain the fact that the greater part of the last twenty miles must have been through thick woods. A better theory would have been that a circuit was made to avoid Hampstead and Highgate Hills. But from recent researches and a curious discovery at Westminster, we are not driven to any such lame conclusions. The Watling Street may well have been a British track before the Roman settlement. Its later course is still easily traced as it approaches the Thames. It passes down the Edgware Road almost to the Marble Arch, and there it divides into two branches, the new and the old. The old branch ran down what is now Park Lane, for a considerable part of the way, through the site of Buckingham Palace and so to Tothill Fields and Thorney Island, on which Westminster Abbey stands. In Roman times Tothill was almost surrounded by water. The whole of St. James's Park was a tidal swamp on one side, and the low-lying fields on the south must have been almost constantly under water. Even as late as the last century the site of Eaton Square was described as a marsh. The Thames must have been readily forded at low water at Westminster, for when we remember that even now it is wider and also shallower here than at London Bridge, we can easily understand that nearly two thousand years ago, when it spread itself over all Pimlico, over Kennington and Newington and Ber-

mondsey, as well as over the places I have named about Westminster, there cannot have been much water left in the river's proper bed. Had there been any reason to doubt the tradition which fixes a ford at Westminster, these considerations would have helped to remove it. The opposite bank of the Thames, close to the new buildings of St. Thomas's Hospital, is called still by its old Saxon name of Stane Gate. Here the Watling Street, interrupted for the moment by the river shallows, resumed its paved course towards Dover. And last year, during the progress of some works in the nave of the abbey church, near the western door, a Roman mosaic pavement was discovered. It will not be going too far if we place here something like a posting-house, a refuge for the traveller who, going into Cantium, had to wait for the fall of the tide before venturing across the river.

The other branch of the Watling Street leaves the Marble Arch along the line of the modern Oxford Street, passes eastward through Holborn in a straight line, descends into the valley of the Fleet, and climbing the opposite hill comes diagonally to Newgate. Before Newgate was built it ran from the crest of the hill in a south-easterly direction till it came to the Wallbrook, where it entered the original Roman fortress at London Stone. Even after the great wall was built it was still recognised, and the Saxons gave it the same name which they gave the road beyond—a name which, with a direction slightly altered to avoid the precinct of St. Paul's, it bears to the present day.

This 'great military way,' the *herepaþ*, as it was in Old-English, was not diverted from its original course

without some good reason, and I can find no reason better than that which is offered us by the building of London Bridge. This must have been after the rebellion of Boadicea; otherwise, far from thinking London a place of no strategical importance, Suetonius would rather have abandoned both Verulam and Camalodunum. At what time the bridge was built we know not; but its great antiquity is witnessed by the discovery in the river's bed of an unbroken line of coins, dating even from the days of the Roman republic, and showing that on passing the river the traveller either had a toll to pay and frequently let his money fall through the wide timbers of the roadway, or, as is more likely, threw it purposely into the water as a tribute to the tutelary deity of the Thames. The building of the bridge must have greatly enhanced the importance of that London which stood north of the river. The narrow limits of the Cantian London, on its low islands, surrounded by marshes, crossed and connected by causeways, were soon rivalled and surpassed by its northern neighbour with the fine and fertile hills of Middlesex behind; and by the time of Carausius the Roman fort was surrounded by a wide ring of suburbs, which extended far beyond the limits afterwards marked by the wall. Among the villas and orchards were tombs, for the invariable regulation forbidding interments in cities did not apply where there was no wall. In later times the long Whitechapel Road—the Vicinal Way—and Holborn Hill answered to the Appian Way at Rome and the Street of Tombs without the Gate of Herculaneum at Pompeii.

The short-lived empire of Carausius, and of his

murderer and successor Allectus, do not very much concern London except in one particular. They led to the building of the wall. Indeed, the two chief events in the history of Roman London, the building of the bridge and the building of the wall, might alone have been mentioned, as they are the only two events of the period which had any permanent effect on its later existence. But for the wall, but for the bridge, Roman London might as well never have been built, so entire is the breach of continuity in the succession of events which follows the invasion of the Saxons.

Like the bridge, the wall is without a date. We only know that the Frankish mercenaries of Allectus, finding their leader slain in the outskirts while they were still struggling across the bridge, employed themselves in plundering and burning among the wealthy villas which surrounded the pretorium. Asclepiodotus burst upon them while thus engaged, and must have perceived the necessity for a larger line of defence than was afforded by the fort. As soon as Constantius arrived, we cannot doubt that something was done, but the exact date of the wall is still unknown. In 350 there was none. In 368 the suburbs, with their villas, their gardens, and their tombs, are enclosed. This is almost the last fact in the history of Roman London. In that year Theodosius, the father of the emperor of the same name, relieved the newly walled city from an attack by the northern barbarians. The fortifications had kept them at bay.

It may be worth while to make a brief survey of this Roman wall, since it still forms in part the city boundary, and since its renewal by Alfred in 886

rendered London impregnable to the Danes, and gave her that early security which enabled her to play so great a part in the drama of English history. To see what a Roman wall was like we have Pevensey and Richborough before us; and I think we shall not be far wrong if we compare the older and inner London to the fort of Rutupiæ, and the second and wider London to the neighbouring city of Canterbury. The wall was strengthened with bastions, some of which were solid masses of masonry, and others hollow towers. Stone, relieved with courses of brick, was the material employed, and occasionally fragments are found of such solidity that they must either be worked into the modern foundations or be blown up with gunpowder. One of these bastions was used by Bishop Gundulf as part of the foundation of the great White Tower; and another may still be seen, with houses built upon it, in the churchyard of St. Giles, Cripplegate. Of a very important feature no vestige remains. The river front was built on piles, and, no doubt, its strength contributed largely to the defences. We know nothing certain as to the gates at this side, but there were probably at least two, exclusive of Dowgate, which was the outlet of the Wallbrook. Of the land gates we only know two, the northern and the western; Bishopsgate and Newgate answered most nearly to them in after years; but no medieval gate was placed exactly on an ancient Roman site. The foundations of the northern gate were lately found in Camomile Street, and showed that in building the wall the ruins of some villa, or possibly a temple, were employed. The carved stones are in the Guildhall Museum, and offer in the debasement of their style

evidences of the low culture of a remote colony. The massive masonry of the western gate was also lately uncovered in Giltspur Street. As it is customary to speak of two other medieval gates as being of Roman origin, it may be worth while to observe here that no Roman building of the kind can have been at Aldgate, the name of which has nothing to do with 'old' or 'eald,' for the simple reason that the eastern road ran, not from Aldgate, but from Bishopsgate, and not to Stratford but to Old Ford. Similarly there can have been no Roman gate at Ludgate, as the wall there looked down on the wide waters of the tidal Fleet with low marshes beyond. The slight eminence on which, in after times, Temple Bar stood was reached from Roman London, not by Ludgate, but by Newgate, and a small bath still exists at the extremity of a promontory which here jutted a few yards into the Thames.

Londinium within this wall was about three miles and a quarter in circumference, and covered a space of about 380 acres. The new Augusta thus became one of the chief towns of the island. But it is well to remember that as she only remained for a few years a Roman city of the first class, we cannot expect to find the relics of any great buildings. The suburbs which the new walls enclosed are not likely to have had anything to show more magnificent than the private villa of a wealthy merchant. The tesselated pavements have been discovered for the most part along the course of the northern highway, and especially in that part of it which ran beside the Wallbrook. Similar marks of occupation are less common on the line of the Watling Street, that is, between Newgate and the present site of

Cannon Street station. No traces of a Christian church have been brought to light, which is the more strange as Augusta was always a Christian city. There was a British bishop, named Restitutus, at the council of Arles in 314, and it has frequently been asserted that he was Bishop of London. The difficulty of this assignment is that London, or Augusta, did not exist as a city in 314, and probably not for half a century later.

The last fact relating to London before the Saxon conquest is its mention in the Chronicle. There is no need to enlarge on the simple directness of the narrative. Under the year 457 we read: 'This year Hengest and Æsc, his son, fought against the Britons at the place which is called Creganford, and there slew four thousand men; and the Britons then forsook Kent and in great terror fled to London.'

There is no further mention of London until we come to the year 604, when we read that Augustine consecrated Mellitus 'to preach baptism to the East-Saxons.' Their king was nephew to the great Æthelberht of Kent, and the Chronicle makes a curious statement as to London. We may press it too far if we suppose it to mean that London belonged to Æthelberht rather than to Sæberht, king of the East-Saxons; but it distinctly asserts that 'Ethelberht gave to Mellitus a bishop's see at London,' and moreover tells us that Sæberht was king by the appointment of his Kentish uncle. Æthelberht was then overking of the East-Saxons as well as king of Kent, and probably held London as an independent possession before he made it over to Mellitus. Beda tells us that London was the 'metropolis of the East-Saxons,' but he uses this

term in a strictly ecclesiastical sense, and we can hardly gather more from it. The bishop, however, of a Saxon see would reside as near the court as possible, and probably Sæberht made his head-quarters in London. After his death the men of London relapsed into barbarism and Mellitus fled. Soon afterwards the East-Saxons, marching against the West-Saxons, were defeated and subdued, but London does not figure in the story, and we hear little or nothing about it except the names of bishops, whose appointment successively by the kings of Northumbria and Mercia shows us into whose hands the city had fallen.

Such are the meagre facts which relate to the conquest of London. The name of the Middle-Saxons does not occur. We do not know whether there was a siege and a massacre of the Britons as at Anderida. We may suppose that, like Canterbury for a time, like Richborough still, London lay empty. The Saxons did not fight behind walls, and hated the task of building burghs and working with bricks. The wall would be of no use unless it was perfect in every part; and we find the Danes bursting in as they pleased over and over again. Yet the commercial importance of the situation seems to have kept London from any long period of desolation, and its trade is made mention of in the exceedingly ancient laws attributed to Hlothhære and Eadric his nephew, who were kings of Kent after 673. Lunden-wic is named, and we have 'the king's wic-reeve,' the king's hall, and 'the altar.' In effect, this law shows us almost certainly that, though London was a market resorted to by the people of the neighbouring kingdoms, and though the king—we know not

whether the king of Essex or the king of Kent—appointed a reeve to regulate dealings, there was no such remnant of corporate or municipal life as some have supposed. It is a favourite doctrine with one school of English historians that municipal institutions have come down to us, especially in London, from the Romans, without any breach of continuity. A longer book than this might be written on this one question; but it will be best to treat of it here with brevity, and to say at once that not a single fact of any kind has yet been adduced that will go even a little way towards proving this romantic theory. Except the name of London itself and a fragment of the wall, there is not a trace of the Roman occupation above ground. It rests with those who assert the municipal continuity of Roman and Saxon London to find some sign or proof of it, however slight, but they have failed to do so. On the other hand, we have the king's officer, the wickreeve, mentioned as existing at the latter part of the seventh century; and, as we shall see very shortly, he was still the chief civil authority in the latter part of the eleventh. If any municipality survived from Roman times, or even any guild, and was the root and origin of the mayor and corporation of the Middle Ages, how comes it that their authority was suspended from 673 to 1066, and the government of London as a commercial city was conducted by a wickreeve or portreeve—the two words mean exactly the same—a portreeve who was appointed by the king, and from whose decision there was an appeal to 'the altar'? Without pressing the use of the word too far, for 'altar' here may be merely a reference to a peculiarly solemn

form of compurgation, or to the ordeal, we still must recognise that we have here the civil and ecclesiastical authorities already in union, as when, nearly four hundred years later, the Norman Conqueror addressed himself to 'William bishop and Gosfrith portreeve.' As we can trace the growth of the wickreeve until he becomes mayor, and as we can find the origin of each separate official, without any possibility of assigning him a Roman, seldom even a Saxon, beginning, it will be sufficient to assert as positively as I can that, thanks to great recent discoveries among the archives of St. Paul's, there is but little difficulty in following step by step the progress of every part of the municipal organisation. There is not, as the late Mr. Toulmin Smith well remarked, 'the shadow of an analogy' between Saxon and Roman institutions of this kind.

The Danish wars desolated London, which does not even seem to have been bettered by the peace of Wedmore in 878. Its situation near the edge of the Danelaw boundary, which passed along the Lea to Bedford, left it exposed to suffer by every convulsion, however slight. From 872 the Danes seemed to have occupied it; but its possession must have appeared a necessity to the military genius of Alfred. In spite of its great strategical importance, it is evident that the Danes set no great store by it, and suffered the walls to fall out of repair. Alfred opened the siege in 884, and shortly drove out the Danes, at whose departure it seems certain that of the old London of the Romans and the East-Saxons nothing remained but the broken wall, a wide space empty of inhabitants, a waste of ruins.

To Alfred must be attributed the foundation of the

London that now is. We have had many commemorations and centenaries of late, some of which have had reference to mythical events in the history of Alfred and in the history of London; but though an Oxford college has celebrated its institution by Alfred, and though St. Peter's-upon-Cornhill has been made ridiculous by a religious service designed to foster belief in a legendary King Lucius, it does not seem to have occurred to any one that exactly a millennium has just elapsed since Alfred founded London. So important however is this settlement, so completely must it be regarded as the ultimate fact in any continuous narrative relating to the history of London, that it would be hardly wrong to commence with some such sentence as this: 'London was founded exactly a thousand years ago by King Alfred, who chose for the site of his city a place formerly fortified by the Romans, but desolated successively by the Saxons and the Danes.'

Without going so far as this, it will save trouble to point out that, though we have occasional notices of the existence of London before his time, it is only after 886 that its annals can be written, and it is only from the rudiments of a municipal constitution, which Alfred planted, that the medieval and modern corporation grew. The gradual development of London has not hitherto been traced. The task until lately was impossible for want of materials. The views of one party which would give our mayor and aldermen a Roman descent, and of another which would refer them to the beneficence or weakness of such a ruler as John, will not fit with the newly ascertained facts; but as I am anxious to avoid controversial matters, if only because



ROMAN LONDON.

of the limited scope of the present work, I will endeavour in the next four chapters to place before the reader a simple and straightforward narrative, referring him to the authorities if he desires further information or finds it impossible to accept my conclusions. When the early history has been told—the history, that is, of London before the end of the thirteenth century—and when, from the new sources of information, never hitherto accessible, we have traced the gradual growth of the municipality, we may be obliged to abandon the strictly narrative form, and in the concluding chapters to notice in detail only those facts which tell directly on the modern condition of London and its influence on England.

CHAPTER II.

THE PORTREEVES.

Alfred's Settlement—The Roman Lines abandoned—The Government—First mention of the Bridge—Local Names—Personal Names—Portreeves—Accuracy of Stow's List—The Norman Conquest—The Charter of William—The state of Trade—Aldermen before 1115—The Tower—The Charter of Henry I.—The Guild—The Portsoken—The Great Families—Orgar le Prude—The Canons of Aldgate—Prosperity of London under Henry I.—Stephen—The Great Fire—Henry II.—John and Longchamp—The Commune acknowledged—The Mayoralty—A City Worthy.

It is still possible with a map to reconstruct the lines of the new settlement. The ward boundaries, for instance, show us, in a more or less modified form, the ancient estates, or sokes of the early city magnates. The parochial divisions again indicate plainly where the settlement was thickest and the population densest. The lines of the streets, now following, now crossing the boundaries, are full of suggestions as to the gradual growth of the city within the limits drawn by the Roman wall. We see that the first settlers crowded about the bridge foot and spread along the two great highways towards Newgate and Bishopsgate. Many remained by the shore of the Thames, many nestled under the shadow of St. Paul's. In such places the

wards and the parishes are small, and there are clear indications of division and subdivision. St. Mary Somerset and St. Mary Mount Haw must have been originally a single parish, and All Hallows the Less must have been comprised in All Hallows the Great. The utter oblivion into which the Roman period had fallen is shown both in the direction of the two chief roads and in the position of the gates to which they led. On the northern side the Roman gate lay considerably to the east of Bishopsgate, and its remains have been found in Camomile Street. So too the gate on the Watling Street had opened considerably to the north of what we call Newgate, which at first was known as Westgate. The line of the Ermin Street did not anywhere coincide exactly with the Roman road, and the new Watling Street actually crossed the old one. Some districts seem to have long lain comparatively empty; and the great size of such wards as Farringdon and Coleman Street and Aldgate show that in the outskirts of the city the population was small and scattered. There was a vast open market-place on the Watling Street known as the West Cheap, another at the meeting-place of the roads near the bridge known as the East Cheap, and spaces devoid of habitations, like the district on which the Grey Friars afterwards settled within Newgate, or the 'Romelands' at Billingsgate and Dowgate. The folkland south-west and east of St. Paul's connected the sacred precincts with the market-place, and continued for centuries to be the chief meeting-place of the citizens. Long afterwards, when 'folkland' had become 'king's land,' the mayor and commonalty sued the dean and chapter for encroach-

ments, and for having enclosed with a mud wall a piece of ground on which the people had been used to hold their court. But the Church was too powerful in the reign of Edward II. for the citizens to succeed in such an action, and when, in the reign of Edward's great grandson, the king and the people met on the day that Walworth slew Wat Tyler, it was without the old walls at Smithfield.

There is no reason to suppose that the government established by Alfred and his successors in London differed in any important particulars from that of any English borough. The alderman of Mercia, Alfred's son-in-law, governed and defended it successfully against the Danes; but we do not find that after his death 'the Lady' Ethelfleda was connected with it, although it has been said that she formally resigned London to her brother, as if Æthelred had held it in fee, a legal nicety which betrays its origin. No doubt London, during the continuance of the Danish wars, was more or less in a 'state of siege,' or under what we should call martial law, or direct military and personal government, and was frequently the residence of the king. There are various traditions as to the site of the king's 'bury,' and we may safely reject that which connects Guthorm-Æthelstan with Gutter Lane, and with the house known in 1532 as 'sum tyme the Place of Sainct Aethelbert, King.' That the king's house was in this part of London and looked upon Cheap is in itself more than probable. The tradition therefore which Stow mentions, but which, as we have seen, is older than his time, that a palace stood north of Cheap and near Adel Street, which, as far back as the reign of Henry III., was known as

Atheling Street, is in itself worthy of more attention than we can generally bestow on traditions. It may not be going too far to see in Aldermanbury, the original site of the Guildhall, another relic of the royal court; and the abbey of St. Albans claimed to have received from a very early king, Offa of Mercia, or perhaps Offa of Essex still earlier, the grant of a church in Wood Street, adjoining the palace.

Passing for the moment those events which connect London with the history of the kingdom, the long Danish wars, the death of Æthelred the Unready and his burial in St. Paul's, the death of Eadmund, the elections of Cnut, of Harold and of Harthacnut, in which London took part, we may confine our attention to the few local and personal names which, hardly visible across the long dim ages, still throw a pale light on the London of the portreeves. The old British name still clung to the place. 'Lundenbrige' was in existence in Eadgar's day, because a witch was drowned there; and the same king, exactly a hundred years before the Norman Conquest, dated a charter 'on Lundenbyrig,' that is, in the burgh of London. The name thus gradually assumed its modern form, and Æthelred mentions the bishop of 'Lundone,' while Cnut, about 1033, refers to St. Paul's as a minster which is situated 'in civitate Lundoniæ.' By the middle of the eleventh century this last form was the common one in Latin documents. The Westgate is named in an old copy of a charter of Burhred of Mercia, as far back as 857; and it is possible that Ludgate was opened before the Norman Conquest. The word 'ludgate' is given in very old vocabularies for a postern, and in itself points to an early date. The church

of St. Paul's finds frequent mention; and St. Martin-le-Grand was in existence, having been founded or re-founded in 1056.

Beside the local names we have a few that are personal. The aldermen, or territorial magnates, of London were like those of the country and of cities like Canterbury, where a freehold estate was held to be a necessary qualification, but they maintained a continuous existence for several centuries, when the aldermen and the thanes had made way for earls and lords. Alongside of the territorial aldermen, owners of sokes, there were aldermen of guilds or trade-unions, and the title was probably applied freely to any eminent person. The king's wick reeve of the laws of Hlothhære and Eadric had become the portreeve.

There is a very interesting and curious list of portreeves in Stow, and allowing for a few errors and a large number of misprints, it seems to be well borne out by the contemporary documents recently discovered. It is easy to see from what rank among the citizens the reeve was chosen, since after his term of office he bears, in numerous contemporary documents recently discovered by Mr. Lyte at St. Paul's, the title of 'alderman.' Before the Conquest Stow enumerates 'Wolfegare,' who is called 'Ulgarus aldremanus'; Sweetman, Leofstan and Alsi (Ælfsige). This last-named personage plays a certain part in the history of England: in the manuscripts he also occurs among the aldermen. Leofstan is frequently mentioned, but his chief title to fame is in the fact that his descendant in the second generation became the first mayor of London. Of Sweetman or Swetman we only know that the Confessor addresses him in a charter. It

is probable the portreeve was appointed by the king from among the members of a particular guild which had leave to hold land, and seems to have included in its ranks the chief territorial magnates. Similar institutions existed at Canterbury, Lincoln, and Oxford, and probably at Winchester, where also the wick reeve had become portreeve. To be without land was to be without share in the government.

In the events which made the eleventh century so memorable in our annals London played a prominent part. Her successful resistance to all the forces Cnut could bring against her shows how complete was the line of defence drawn by Alfred. Indeed, for a time the dominions of Æthelred and Eadmund Ironside were apparently bounded by London Wall. Even Southwark was lost, and Cnut's canal, by which he brought his ships above the bridge, enabled him to cut the English king off from Westminster, if Westminster really existed at the time, as the monks of Eadward's foundation afterwards asserted. The low-lying land, once perhaps a mere chain of islets, on the south side of the Thames, made the cutting of a canal no very arduous task. The shallow boats were easily dragged through the mud. But the walls and the bridge were too strong. Although in 982 a disastrous fire nearly destroyed the city, the walls remained intact, and on Æthelred's death his successor, Eadmund, was crowned by Archbishop Lyfing in St. Paul's, where his father had been buried. The contests of Eadmund and Cnut for the possession of London belong to the history of England. Even Cnut's victory at Assandun did not give him London, though after the treaty of Olney the city opened her gates, and

after Eadmund's death Cnut was elected formally in London and crowned at St. Paul's by the same Archbishop, Lyfing. There was probably an influx of Danish settlers immediately afterwards. One of the earliest civic institutions, which in other cities is the Portmannimote, in London bears the Danish name of 'Hustings.' The liths-men, or navigators, of London figure in the Oxford election of Harthacnut; but for our present purpose it will be sufficient to notice Ansgar and Ulf, who were portreeves when the Conqueror came. Ulf may perhaps be identified with a citizen who lived at St. Michael's, Queenhithe, and whose name occurs frequently as an alderman witnessing documents for the dean and chapter, whose tenant he was. Of Ansgar or Esegar it is needful to take closer notice. A little farther on I shall have occasion to speak of his pedigree; here it will be sufficient to call attention to his Scandinavian name and to say that he may safely be identified with Esegar, the 'staller' who led the Londoners at Hastings, that he was severely wounded, and that he was carried back in a litter to the city for which he had fought and suffered:

'Vulnera pro patriâ quoniam numerosa recepit.'

The valour, or the diplomatic powers of Ansgar told favourably on the fortunes of London in the events which followed. The men who had over and over again beaten the Danes, whose city since its foundation by Alfred had never been taken, were not to be easily conquered, and William showed an example followed by all the greatest rulers of England since his time. It is true he marched on London, but he did not

attack it. Whatever was left of the ancient glories of Southwark, the London, as I have ventured to suppose, of the geographer Ptolemy, no doubt then disappeared. Of these glories the mansion of Earl Godwine must have been one. There is a story that William crossed at Westminster and thus threatened London on the same side of the Thames. This account, as a reference to the last chapter will show, is not so improbable as it might seem at first sight. But William did not provoke the Londoners too far. He was well acquainted with their temper, and probably knew all the principal citizens. Many of them came from Normandy, though Ansgar was of Danish extraction. London was not on the same footing with any other English city, and it, beyond any other, was worthy of being conciliated. The whole story of Ansgar's negotiations with William, of the brief acceptance and withdrawal of Eadgar the Ætheling and of the embassy to Berkhampstead has been elsewhere detailed. With Ansgar and Eadgar came 'all the best men of Lundene,' and the citizens obtained good terms from the new king, terms to which, having once subscribed, William was faithful.

The following is the text of his charter—it is still preserved at the Guildhall—as translated by the Bishop of Chester :—

William king greets William bishop and Gosfrith portreeve, and all the burghers within London, French and English, friendly ; and I do you to wit that I will that ye be all lawworthy that were in King Edward's day. And I will that every child be his father's heir after his father's day : and I will not endure that any man offer any wrong to you. God keep you.

London, it is clear, was included in no earldom. On the contrary, even at that period the citizens professed to claim certain rights over the adjacent 'campagna' of Middlesex, rights which were formally acknowledged later. That children should inherit freely from their parents was a further exemption from the usages of feudalism. The mention of French and English burghers together shows the very mixed condition of the population, and is abundantly borne out by the personal names in the oldest documents. There were merchants from Caen and Rouen, from Germany and Flanders, among the citizens. Already there was trade with the Rhine and the Zuyder Zee, and Norman ships, so far back as the days of Æthelred and even of his father, had brought the wines of the south to London. The emperor's men had already established their stafel-hof, or steelyard, and traded under jealous rules and almost monastic discipline, but with such money that to this day 'sterling' stands beside 'real' as an adjective, for the royal credit was not better than that of the Easterling. Some Germans and Danes who did not belong to the 'Gildhalda Theutonicorum,' as it was called in the thirteenth century, settled in the city beside the Normans of the Conquest, the Frenchmen mentioned in the charter, and the old English stock of law-worthy citizens. The church of St. Paul, enumerating its tenants at the beginning of the twelfth century, has left us the names both of aldermen and of private individuals, and we recognise not only that among the prominent citizens are many foreigners, but also that already the old names are dying out, and the sons of English fathers are adopting French usages.

Sometimes a name, even in a Latin document, is given in English, but Algar 'Mannings-step-son' stands almost alone beside Hugh 'filius Ulgari' and Ralph 'filius Algodi.' The nephew of Hulbold is William and the son of Wlured is Geoffrey. Hacon, the alderman who owned what is now the ward of Broad Street, may have left his Danish name to the neighbouring Hackney, but another family of similar origin had become Saxon in this respect, and Godwin, the son of Ansgar, the son of Æthelstan, the son of Tofig the Proud, may have been the ancestor of the Tovi's or Thovy's who figured long in the city, and one of whom came to a sad end in the thirteenth century. Coleman Street itself may have derived its name from that Ceolmund on whose 'haga' or farm near the Westgate was the little field granted by Burhred; and Albert Lotering, the alderman's tenant, gave his name to Lothbury. Close to the mansion of this wealthy Lotharingian dwelt Reinmund, an alderman, who was succeeded by his more eminent son Azo, the goldsmith, whom it would be interesting to identify with one of the Azors of Domesday. Beside these foreign, or affectedly foreign, names we have a few which have an English sound. Sperling is an alderman, and the name occurs again and again for centuries. Alwold holds Cripplegate, and 'Brichmarus,' who coins the king's money, is alderman of Aldersgate, where ever since the men of the goldsmith's craft have had their headquarters. Another Brihtmær is described as 'bordarius,' but he was an alderman. Dering and Wulfran and Sprot are tenants of the chapter; and beside them dwelt the great Norman nobles, including one who had been in England

while Edward the Confessor yet lived. We read of the town-houses of William Malet, of Ralph Brito, of William de Arundel and William de Pontearch (Pont de l'Arch), and a 'soke' is assigned to the new Earl of Gloucester—Robert, son of Henry—whose fortunes in the wars of Stephen were so intimately connected with those of the city.

The Domesday survey does not include London, but the suburbs, as well as some land which was eventually taken into the city, are described as in Middlesex. William seems to have kept loyally to the terms of his agreement with the citizens. True he built his great castle, the Tower, partly on land which had been within the ancient boundary, and pulled down for the purpose that portion of the old wall which reached from Tower Hill to the Thames; but it is very possible that in the works, so far as they were carried out in his reign, the citizens saw only a strengthening of the old bastions built by Alfred; and the Tower, no doubt, formed a strong defence, turned later into an instrument of oppression and extortion. The citizens protested over and over again for centuries against the interference of the governor with shipping bound for London.

If William benefited the city chiefly by letting it alone, Henry I., who owed it a debt of gratitude for its early recognition of his claim to the crown, issued a charter which in aftertimes was looked upon as the foundation of the Londoners' chief privileges. The exact date of the charter is given by Rymer as 1101. It granted Middlesex to the citizens to farm, and gave them leave to appoint a sheriff for it. Their claim to hunt was allowed for Middlesex and Surrey, and even

as far away as the Chilterns. This in itself was a great concession from a Norman king. Further, the citizens were exempted from attendance at any court without their own walls, and were freed from toll throughout England, from Danegeld, from scot and lot, from weregeld and ordeal; but the most substantial benefit they derived from the charter was the leave to elect their own justiciar. They may 'place whom they will to hold pleas of the crown.' The portreeve is here evidently intended, for it is manifestly absurd to suppose, as some have done, that Henry allowed the citizens to elect a reeve for Middlesex if they could not elect one for themselves; and, if proof were wanting, we have it in the references to the trials before the portreeve which are found in very early documents. In one of these, which cannot be dated later than 1115, Gilbert Proudfoot, or Prutfot, described as 'vicecomes,' is mentioned as having some time before given judgment against the dean and chapter as to a piece of land on the present site of the Bank of England. Down to a late period, when the portreeve had long been superseded by the mayor, the chief official of the city sat both as coroner and as chamberlain. The compiler of a recently published collection of 'Historical Charters' says expressly that 'the king kept to himself the appointment of portreeve or chief magistrate,' but the whole tenor of the charter is contrary to this assumption. At Canterbury also the citizens elected their portreeve from a very early period.

London, or its governing guild, had as endowment what in some other English cities was called 'reeveland,' or a 'port-meadow.' It lay east of Bishopsgate, and

without the wall on the southern side of the great highway into Essex. When Aldgate—properly Algate—was opened, about the beginning of Henry's reign, Sired, a canon of St. Paul's, built a church on land described as belonging to the 'Knightenguild' (cnihtena gild). There was other land adjoining this soke which belonged to the queen, and the connection of her name with Aldgate goes to strengthen the probability of the story which ascribes the stone arch or 'bow' at Stratford to Matilda. A gate opening on the new road would become necessary when the passage of the Lea at Old Ford was abandoned for the new bridge.

The opening of Aldgate, the building of St. Botolph's by Sired, and the mention of the 'Knightenguild' and their land, are all curiously connected with a series of events in which, it has often been supposed, the government of London underwent a radical change. It seems however probable that no very sudden revolution took place, and that the retirement at one time of seven or eight aldermen was neither the consequence nor the cause of any alteration in the city constitution. There can now be no doubt, if any doubt existed before, that the governing body of London was the Knightenguild, as Stow calls it. He has much to say about the institution, and quotes a charter granted to it by William Rufus. 'These Knights,' he says, had also received a charter from King Edward the Confessor, and he repeats a tradition that the guild was founded by King Eadgar, adding a story naturally developed from a mistaken interpretation of 'cnihten' or 'knighten.' But in the reign of Henry I. we find the guild in full possession of the governing rights which are elsewhere attributed

to a guild merchant; and recent researches show us that among the fraternity there was a very large proportion of aldermen, and that those who do not seem themselves to have filled office were the sons or the brothers of aldermen. It is true that the city community was not very elaborately organised, and that Henry's charter makes no mention of the guild. Yet they were able to admit strangers to the franchise of their commonalty. As Bishop Stubbs has observed, the municipal unity was of the same sort as that of the county and the hundred. No change in this respect is made by the terms of the charter. The churches had their sokes, the barons their manors, and the people—at least those who were free of the city—had their folkmote, answering to the shiremote elsewhere; their wardmote, answering to the hundred court; and their weekly hustings, a general meeting of the citizens which developed, or dwindled, into the so-called 'county court.' As in many European cities then, and as in Oriental cities still, a majority of the people belonged to some religious or semi-religious organisation, but, with the single exception of the Knightenguild, these associations had little municipal significance. They were instituted for mutual protection, for 'but-filling' and feasting, for a kind of insurance, and the provision of masses for the souls of deceased members. Each was under the patronage of a special saint: year by year they met in St. Martin's or St. Mary's, and renewed the pledges and vows which bound man to man. Even the governing guild may have had its patron, St. Paul, whose sword figured, centuries later, on the city arms, and at their Guildhall, in Aldermanbury, celebrated rites similar to those of the humbler

guilds. Giraldus Cambrensis, writing at a slightly later period, expressly says of the Guildhall that it has obtained its name from the resort to it of drinkers. Of other civic institutions at this period we know but little. The great fact of Henry's charter is the recognition of London as a corporation, although it still remained an aggregation of manors and sokes, bounded and kept together by the ancient wall. This effect of the charter became speedily known throughout the kingdom. Other cities sought similar recognition, and places as remote from each other as Barnstaple and Yarmouth, as Canterbury and Oxford, obtained charters framed expressly on the model of London.

The aristocratic character of the governing body is abundantly apparent. The aldermen, like the thanes of Canterbury, owned estates which they had inherited from their ancestors, and which they transmitted to their descendants. Not only had they this bond of a common interest, but the individuals composing the Knightenguild were closely connected by blood. They were brothers, or cousins, or were related by marriage.

We have seen the probability that Ansgar the Staller was only one of a line of city rulers. The descendants of Levestan or Leofstan, who had also been portreeve before the Conquest, were probably the chiefs of this municipal aristocracy, and the head of the family in 1125 was Ailwin or 'Ailwin Child,' as he is occasionally called, a title almost certainly denoting noble or distinguished birth. He had married Christina, the daughter of Orgar the Proud, or 'le Prude,' a wealthy alderman whose name figures very frequently in the annals of the time, and who

is still commemorated in the city by the name of a parish. The church of St. Martin 'Orgar's' disappeared for ever in the great fire of 1666, as did another of his foundation, St. Botolph's, Billingsgate, but we can identify him in the Ordgarus who, a quarter of a century after the date of Henry's charter, conducted with the king a negotiation which had the effect of extinguishing the Knightenguild and of transferring the reeveland from the municipality to the church. As this transaction is often thought to have led, directly or indirectly, to the establishment of the mayoralty and other changes, it will be worth while to put the sequence of events into chronological order.

Shortly after the probable date of the opening of Aldgate a priory of Augustinian canons, dedicated to the Holy Trinity, was founded close to it by Norman, the queen's chaplain. Matilda gave the new house her soke near the gate, and by assiduous begging the prior got together a small estate, consisting chiefly of land in the city. Long after the queen's death the lords of the adjacent manor, the portsoken, then fifteen in number, members of the Knightenguild, and all, or nearly all, aldermen, took the resolution, so characteristic of the religious life of the twelfth century, to enter Norman's priory, and, not content with dedicating their own lives, resolved, if possible, to dedicate also to ecclesiastical uses the estate of which they were the trustees. This was, of course, not so easily done; but Orgar, one of the devoted fifteen, went to the king and obtained his leave to endow the priory with the portsoken. The estate itself was erected into a 'ward without,' and the prior became its alderman. His duties were discharged by a deputy at

least as late as the time of Prior Eustace in 1214, but Stow remembered to have seen the prior of Aldgate, as alderman of Portsoken, riding in a civic procession with a scarlet gown over his monastic cowl, before the dissolution. 'Sithens the which dissolution of that house,' he continues, 'the said ward of Portsoken hath been governed by a temporall man.'

Although so many aldermen retired at one time, and although they took with them into the cloister, so to speak, the very endowment of the portreeve, no change seems to have passed over the government of the city. Not only did things go on as before, but the same families were still paramount. Ailwin becomes a canon, but Ailwin's son becomes an alderman. The succession of portreeves is uninterrupted. We have the names of some of them in the records of the Exchequer. Occasionally two or three, once as many as five, came to answer for the city and pay the 300*l.* which was the farm of Middlesex. In 1129, a few years only after the retirement of Orgar and his companions, we read of 'quatuor vicecomites' as attending for London. The following year we hear of a single 'camerarius.' The 'Hugh Buche' of Stow may be identified with the Hugo de Bock of the St. Paul's documents, and his 'Richard de Par' with Richard the younger, the chamberlain. 'Par' is probably a misreading for 'parvus' contracted. In the reign of Stephen two members of the Buckerel family hold office, and we have Fulcred and Robert, who were related to each other. Another early portreeve was Wluardus, who attends at the Exchequer in 1138, and who continued to be an alderman thirty years later. Family interests were very strong, and it will probably be found, on a further inspection of the

newly-discovered records, that many of the great men of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were descended from the old territorial lords of London. The Thovys, as we have seen, may have been the posterity of Ansgar, and the Haverells derived from Brichmar the goldsmith, alderman of the ward of Aldersgate. It is all but certain that Walter Hervey, in some respects the greatest of London mayors, was the direct descendant, in the male line, of Orgar the Proud. The Corenhells were doubtless the posterity of a member of the Knightenguild who is named Edward 'Hupcornhill.' In short, a little research demonstrates more and more clearly the truth of Bishop Stubbs's remark, that London had at this period, and long afterwards, an aristocratic constitution, and its unity rather in the system of the shire than in the municipal principle. These aldermen had long pedigrees and great estates, even though they engaged in trade. The fiction that commerce is degrading had not yet been invented; and it was an ancient law of England that the man who fared thrice across the sea by his own craft became worthy of thane right; the equal, that is, of the owner of five hides of land, or the lord of a manor.

The prosperity of the city increased enormously during the long reign of Henry I., and even the unsettled times of Stephen failed to injure it permanently. Trade increased with increased facility of access to the Continent, and men of all nations thronged to the London markets. The name of a portreeve in 1158, 'Gaufridus Bursarius,' may indicate the existence of some institution like the Royal Exchange, for a bourse existed at a very early period at Bruges, and

the family to whom it belonged were named after it 'van der Buerse,' not very much later, according to Mr. Weale. About the same date we begin to meet with increasing frequency the name of a prominent citizen, Henry 'of Lundenston,' so called from his residence being in the parish of St. Swithin, in the narrow valley of the Wallbrook. He was the son of Ailwin and the grandson, maternally, of Orgar, who had gone into the Priory of the Holy Trinity. He was both born to wealth and to civic honour, for he was the head of the greatest of the governing families and the heir of Leofstan the portreeve. When he signs a document his name comes next after that of the 'vicecomes,' and his influence seems to have been enormous, whether he was, like his grandfather, a goldsmith, or, as some have supposed, a draper, or, as is possible, merely a great landowner, the descendant and heir of Ailwin 'child.' It may be worth while here to mention that in such a form as 'Henry Fitz Ailwin' or 'Eilward Fitz Wizel,' the 'Fitz' is used for the Latin 'Filius.' I do not know when 'Fitz' became usual in London, but it was before the reign of Henry III.

The Londoners supported Stephen, whom in their folkmote they had formally elected king. His repeated failures before the party of the empress must be put down to the weakness of his own character, while his ultimate success must be mainly attributed to the loyal support of the city. His rival, Matilda, had one chance of conciliating the citizens, and she threw it away. The immemorial liberties which had been enjoyed for generations, and confirmed by William and by Henry, were taken from the city, which for the first and last time in its history was put 'in demesne.'

The Earl of Essex, Geoffrey of Mandeville, whose father is said by Stow to have been Portreeve, was given Middlesex 'in farm,' with the Tower for his castle, and no person could hold pleas either in city or county without his permission. The feelings of the Londoners were fully roused. Though Stephen was actually a prisoner, and Matilda's fortunes never seemed brighter, her cause was lost. The ecclesiastical authorities were on her side, and she was even invited to visit the city. But there her behaviour was unconciliatory. The citizens soon saw that her putting them in demesne was no mistake committed in a hasty moment in times of confusion, but was part of a settled policy. This decided the waverers and doubled the party of Stephen. Their demonstrations were so threatening that Matilda withdrew towards Winchester, whither the Londoners followed her, capturing on the way the empress's stoutest and wisest supporter, Earl Robert, noticed above as lord of a soke in the city. This stroke of good luck altered the whole aspect of affairs. Stephen was exchanged for the Earl of Gloucester, the Tower was surrendered, the dominion was removed, and London had its liberty once more; but after such an experience it is not wonderful that the citizens held loyally to Stephen during the short remainder of his life.

But for London, the chief event of Stephen's reign was not of a political character. The Great Fire, as for more than five hundred years it was called, occurred in 1136. It spread from St. Paul's eastward, consuming the bridge and the houses and churches, most of which were built of no more enduring material than wood. The use of such forms as 'Stanechurch' and

'Staining' is evidence that stone was not commonly used even for churches, and the promulgation, some years later, of the series of regulations which goes by the name of the Assize of Henry FitzAilwin, shows plainly how ill constructed and unsafe were the houses of private citizens. Under this 'Assize of Building' any citizen could demand, at the weekly hustings, that the mayor and a committee or jury of twelve men should enforce the rules, many of which turn on the employment of stone, for which every possible advantage and encouragement was given. 'It should be remembered,' so runs the Assize, 'that in ancient times the greater part of the city was built of wood, and the houses were covered with straw and stubble and the like.' Hence it happened that, when a single house had caught fire, the greater part of the city was destroyed.

Henry II. was too astute a ruler not to put himself at once on a good footing with the citizens. One of his first acts was to confirm the great charter of his grandfather. A contemporary writer, Fitzstephen, says significantly that the city is most happy, 'at least where it is well governed,' and expresses his anxiety lest the policy of the king should change. The number of sheriffs had now been definitely settled as two, and only one addition was required to complete the civic edifice. The establishment of a commune on the French model is sometimes said to have followed the proceedings taken by John and the citizens against William of Longchamp, Bishop of Ely, who was chancellor during Richard's absence; but so many city chroniclers date the mayoralty at the beginning of Richard's reign, and it is so improbable that John, of all princes, especially

in the king's absence, would alter the constitution of the city, that it is far safer to adopt the received and old-fashioned opinion, which, moreover, is the only one that will square with the early mention of the commune and franchise. True, John called the citizens together to advise with him and his lords against Longchamp, but this act was no new establishment of a commune, though the citizens took the opportunity of swearing John and the other great men of the realm to respect their liberties. The commune, such as it was, existed before, and had been fully, if tacitly, recognised in the great charter of Henry I.

The idea also that King John by a special charter, in 1214, granted leave to the citizens to elect a mayor falls to the ground before the evidence of documents. A deed among the archives of St. Paul's mentions 'Henry, Mayor of the City of London,' in 1193, and it is very probable that further examination will reveal an earlier date than this. It is however certain, so far, that the mayoralty was in existence four years after the received date of 1189. In another deed, written before 1187, Henry FitzLefstan signs next after William Fitz-Ysabel, the portreeve, who himself was sheriff afterwards in 1193, and before Roger FitzAlan, who more than a quarter of a century later succeeded to the mayoralty. When Richard, in the beginning of his reign, showered charters on the English boroughs in order to obtain money for his great expedition, it is more than probable that London was not left out. The charter raising the portreeve to the rank of mayor, if there was such a charter, has been lost, and the earliest signed by Richard is dated towards the end of his reign. One thing, at

all events, comes out plainly. The mayoralty was established without any civic convulsion, and every circumstance which can be gathered now, after the lapse of six centuries, goes to show that the old aristocratic predominance continued. Stow and others have asserted that the mayor was at first called 'bailiff,' but when we first meet with the new office in 1193, in a contemporary manuscript, the French form is used. The first mayor may be considered, as we have seen, the head of the best city family, and his first sheriffs bore names which are to be found in the oldest lists of aldermen that have come down to us. That the secession of the Knightenguild more than sixty years before was in any way connected with a civic revolution which established the commune and the mayoralty is a theory which, with the civic revolution itself, fails to accord with any of the facts of the case.

Fitzstephen's account of London at the time of the birth of St. Thomas at Canterbury, the son of Gilbert Becket, sometime portreeve, is well known and full of suggestive passages. The future martyr was born in a house on the north side of Cheap, where in after years a stately church arose. Agnes, the saint's sister, was married to a member of a good old city family, Theobald Agodshalf (in Latin, 'Ex parte Dei'), who was baron of Hulles or Helles, in Ireland. She joined with her husband in founding, on the site of the home of the Beckets, the hospital of St. Thomas of Acon. The name seems to be connected with Acre, but there are grounds for believing that there is a reference here to some local feature, such as an oak tree, in the Cheap. The Mercers' Chapel now marks the place.

CHAPTER III.

THE MAYORS.

Date of the Mayoralty—The Sheriffs—FitzOsbert—The first Common Council—The early Guilds—Localisation of Trades—Growth and strength of the Commune—The succession of Mayors—Waning influence of the Great Families—The descendants of FitzAilwin—Simon de Montfort and FitzThomas—Oppression of London by Henry III.—Walter Hervey—His Charters—Condition of London at the return of Edward I.

THE preponderance of authority in favour of the first year of Richard I. as the date of the establishment of a new form of government in London is very great, but as the mayor does not appear upon the page of history before 1194, and as the gradual character of the change is now for the first time capable of proof, it has been usual for the modern school of scientific historians to fix upon 1191 as the year and the deposition of Longchamp as the occasion. The mayor was appointed one of the treasurers of Richard's ransom in 1194, but is mentioned, as we have seen, at least a year earlier in a document at St. Paul's. The citizens were probably represented by their mayor at the first, and certainly at the second, coronation of Richard, and at the latter ceremony contended with Winchester for the office of butler at the royal feast. The prominent part played by Ralph de Diceto, the great dean of St. Paul's,

in these ceremonies, belongs to English history. He may have had a share in the establishment of the mayoralty, and it is interesting at least to see his signature beside that of Henry FitzAilwin in several contemporary documents.

The sheriffs who were in their second year of office when Richard ascended the throne were Richard Fitz-Reiner and Henry de Cornhill. The first named was son of one of the five 'vicecomites' who jointly answered for the city early in the reign of Henry II., and the grandson of Berengar, who was probably of Italian or Lombard origin. Henry de Cornhill was a member of one of the old city families, probably the grandson of Edward 'Hup-Cornhill' who went into the priory of Aldgate with Orgar the Proud. The sheriffs appeared prominently when John and the barons entered London to coerce Longchamp, but took opposite sides. Richard supported John, whom he entertained in his house; while Cornhill, who was Master of the Mint, identified himself with the obnoxious chancellor. Great additions had been made to the defences at the Tower, and land had been taken for the purpose, not only from the estate of the priory of Aldgate—that estate which had been, as we have seen, the ancient 'reeveland' of London—but also from the Hospital of St. Katharine, which Stephen's queen had founded. The wealthy citizens suffered severely. Among them was William 'of the Longbeard,' a popular favourite, the son of Osbert, one of the aldermen who had entered Aldgate priory as a canon in 1125. Osbert had, in accordance with the usage of the day, the convenient and distinctive nickname of 'Drinchepinne,' or 'Drinchpyg,' which

refers to the pins or pegs in tankards, and sufficiently indicates his employment—perhaps his habits. William FitzOsbert was, with Geoffrey, a goldsmith—probably the 'Gaufridus Bursarius' mentioned in the last chapter—concerned in a crusade against the Moors in Portugal in 1190, and was considered, partly on account of a vision of St. Thomas of Canterbury, which had appeared to him, a personage of extraordinary sanctity. In some accounts he is called an alderman. He spoke out boldly against illegal tallages, having himself been a victim of the exactions of Longchamp, and we may feel sure that whatever influence he possessed with the citizens was exerted against the chancellor.

'When in the midst of the struggle John took the oath to the commune of London, and was followed by the whole body of the barons who adhered to him, it is probable he acted at the suggestion of Richard Fitz-Reiner, and gave completeness to a municipal constitution which had long been struggling for recognition.' This is the opinion of Bishop Stubbs, who goes on to speak of Henry FitzAilwin, dating his mayoralty from this year, 1191. As we have seen, there is something to be said on the other side; but so far, until an earlier mention of Henry of London Stone as mayor has been found in a contemporary document, the bishop's view is entitled to a place in any book purporting to deal with London history. The establishment of the mayoralty involved a change in the position of the sheriffs. They ceased to be the rulers of the city, 'and become merely the financial representatives of the citizens, who are themselves properly the "fermers," or sheriffs of London and Middlesex.'

John, after consultation with the aldermen, assembled the people in folkmote by sounding the great bell which stood between West Cheap and St. Paul's. A letter from the absent king was read to them, and the crowd by acclamation decreed the deposition of Longchamp. They did not, however, fare much better under his successors. Assessments, scutages, and tallages went on as before. The king's rapacity was unbounded. The first and greatest charge of all was for Richard's ransom, and under Archbishop Hubert things seem to have come to a head. William of the Longbeard took the lead in resisting a poll-tax, which fell heavily, as he said, on the poor and lightly on the rich. The rulers of the city, equally with the King's council, would oppose a man who preached such doctrines. Some citizens were killed in a riot which he was said to have excited, but the archbishop dealt leniently with Longbeard, whom he summoned to Lambeth and dismissed unpunished. The city authorities, however, took measures to have him arrested. He broke away and got safe into Bow Church in the middle of the market-place, and defended himself. The archbishop arrived, and, as Easter was close at hand, he endeavoured to persuade William and his companions to surrender, but in vain. The door was fired and its defenders had to make a rush, but were soon overpowered, and were shortly afterwards hanged in Smithfield. The people made Longbeard a martyr, which in a sense he was; but it is curious to observe that the exchange of the old form of government for a new one, the substitution of the commune for the ancient organisation of the shire, is marked by the commencement of a long struggle between the people and an oligarchy of

wealth. This struggle went on with varying phases for centuries. The practice by which the alderman bought or inherited his office was slow to die out. Although it was said that Longbeard numbered 50,000 adherents, we must look at such figures with great suspicion, and may feel pretty sure that large spaces in the city were still but thinly inhabited. The wards were still, with certain exceptions, such as that of Cheap, called by the names of their ruling aldermen. Their number is uncertain, but at the commencement of the thirteenth century it was probably not more than nineteen or twenty at the outside. This point is worth noting, because in 1200 there 'were chosen five-and-twenty of the more discreet men of the city, and sworn to take counsel on behalf of the city, together with the mayor,' and it has sometimes been assumed that this was the beginning of the court of aldermen. As we have seen, however, the aldermen were in existence long before, and the question is how far they were, under ordinary circumstances, the councillors and assistants of the mayor. It is very probable that the aldermen and lords of the city manors held to some extent aloof—as they long did at Winchester—from popular movements, and exercised their jurisdiction apart. There was, no doubt, in London at this time what in modern phrase may be termed a 'leisure class;' and though the migration of city families into the country was afterwards very rapid it had as yet hardly begun. It is easy to trace several generations of the same race, all living in the city, and sometimes giving their names permanently to the region they owned or inhabited. The 'bury' of the Basings is 'Bassishaw.' The Bokerels have Bokerelsbury or Bucklersbury, and the Farringdons,

uniting two whole wards, Ludgate and Newgate, with the region beyond the Fleet, ('ultra Fletam,') into a single estate, called it after themselves.

This aristocracy of land and race went hand in hand with the aristocracy of wealth. The two elements which composed the civic oligarchy were united by blood as well as by the common interest of restraining the upward movement of the people and retaining power in their own hands. The institution of the common council was the first direct blow at this supremacy, but had, no doubt, its first effect in promoting union among the aldermen. The merchant guild, of whose existence we have had such slight and shadowy proofs, was at once wholly merged in the new community. The common council, the aldermen and the mayor, made up what we should call the corporation, but, though forms of popular election were little understood, their power rested mainly on the broad base of the folkmote. The ultimate appeal was to the people. Longbeard was dead, but his preaching was not forgotten; by slow degrees 'the vulgar' made their strength felt, the question most often at issue being that for which he had laid down his life. The people left matters of executive, the punishment of malefactors, the preservation of order to the magistrates, but in matters of finance and in matters relating to the external policy of London the commons struggled hard to make their voices heard. Thus, when in 1249 a conference was held by the mayor and aldermen with the king's justices, the people interfered, refusing to allow any business to be transacted without their leave; and in 1257 they set aside the decision of the aldermen

on a question relating to weights and measures. There were many other examples of this growth of popular feeling and popular power, and the decisions of the folkmote at this period had an undying influence on the future of the city. The activity of the thirteenth century in Western Europe in art, in letters, in science was shown by London in politics. What was useful in the French communal system was adopted while the old guilds still lived, and moulded the foreign principle into English forms.

The first distinct indication that the craftsmen of London had organised themselves into guilds is afforded by an entry in the Exchequer Rolls as far back as the year 1180, when the ministers of Henry II. fined at one time as many as eighteen guilds which had been formed without special leave. Some appear to have been formidable trade combinations, others were wholly local, and a few evidently only religious. Religion rather than trade was however still the main object of these associations, and this element, which survived, at least in name, in the composition of the later companies till the sixteenth century, was not formally abolished by Act of Parliament till 1552. We may accept it as certain that no guild was without its saintly patron and its special place of worship. Once a year the saddlers assembled at St. Martin's, and the drapers in the chapel of Bethlehem Hospital; but to speak at the present day of the Merchant Taylors as the guild of St. John or of the Grocers as the guild of St. Anthony is, to say the least, an anachronism. There is a London guild still in existence, but only one, the Artillery Company, which James I., in contravention of the

statute, dedicated to St. George; and it will be best, in order to understand clearly the course of events in the development of London's civic institutions on the one hand and her commercial prosperity on the other, to keep the guilds of the thirteenth century and the companies of to-day wholly apart in our minds.

The Exchequer list of 'adulterine,' that is, unlicensed guilds, is a document of some interest. The use of the word 'alderman' in its middle sense, as denoting neither a noble of the time of Alfred nor a civic dignitary of the time of John, is curious. We read of a guild of goldsmiths whereof Ralph Flael is alderman and of a guild of butchers whereof William Lafeite is alderman. There are guilds also of pepperers, of scrivenors, and of travellers—'peregrinorum.' Four are localised as 'de Ponte,' and one as 'de Haliwell,' which shows that not only the bridge but also the ward, or part of a ward, now called Cripplegate Without, was already peopled, for 'Haliwell' was in Finsbury, and was the manor of a canon of St. Paul's. The only guild whose patron is named in the list is that of St. Lazarus, which was probably a charitable society analogous to the modern Italian 'miserecordia,' and was evidently recruited among the wealthy classes, as the fine imposed is twenty-five marks, while the butchers and the scrivenors only paid one. A few of the aldermen of guilds may be recognised as aldermen also of wards, Ralph Flael for example, and William Haverell.

Besides these guilds there were several which were licensed. Among them the most important in London, as in other cities of Europe, was the guild of weavers. A charter was granted to them by Henry II., in which

they were not only allowed to exist but to regulate trade. They are described in this document, the earliest of the kind which has come down to us, as a guild, and as they included in their ranks the whole clothing industry—tailors, drapers, fullers, shearmen and clothworkers—they became so formidable as a trades-union that one of the first acts of the new corporation was to obtain their suppression from King John. This measure appears to have been absolutely necessary to the well-being of the city, as the numbers, wealth, and antiquity of the weavers' guild made it little less than a rival to the governing body. The weavers had paid two marks of gold annually for leave to hold their guild, and the city authorities were willing to pay ten times that sum for their abolition. They probably broke up into sections, of which the tailors retained the ancient name, 'telarii,' though the clothworkers probably included the greater number of members. Both these confraternities and others connected with this trade formed themselves later into companies, and a company of weavers, which is too often confounded with the ancient guild, was licensed by Edward I. in a charter in which a reference was made to the older organisation. This charter and one of Edward II. were called in question in the following reign by the city authorities, who dreaded a revival of the formidable combination suppressed by John. Their alarm was needless. The Weavers' Company continued to drag out a feeble existence till the introduction of silk, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, gave them a fresh lease of life. They are now however among the smallest of the companies, and their name is only interesting for its venerable associations. The Weavers'

Company is not the only one which claims to represent directly an ancient guild, but it is the only one whose claim has anything so like a reasonable foundation.

The other contemporary guilds were the goldsmiths', the bakers', and the saddlers', all of which in turn showed signs of strength, and were jealously watched and heavily taxed by the Government. The different trades had each its own quarter in the city, Cheap itself being now invaded by buildings which were more or less permanent, and certain parts of the old market-place, at the eastern and western ends, and on the site of the street now called Old Change, were built upon for the purpose of raising money for the new bridge in 1281. Some of them must have resembled an Eastern bazaar at the present day. The mercers were established close to the new church of St. Mary-le-Bow, so called from its stone arches and to distinguish it from the mother church of 'Aldermary.' Beside the mercers were the grocers, who specially affected the neighbourhood of Soper Lane, now Queen Street, and, to the south of them, the shoemakers. So completely were the trades thus localised that in some instances London wards have retained in their names a memory of the staple industry of the quarter. The bakers worked in Bread Street, the blacksmiths in Ironmonger Lane; while the chief landing-place for wine was above London Bridge, in the Vintry. Trades are often also localised for us by the parochial names: St. James Garlickhithe, St. Margaret Pattens, St. Mildred Poultry, and St. Martin Pomery. St. Mary Woolchurchhaw with St. Mary Woolnoth (woollen hithe) were probably at first a single parish and the centre of the wool trade, the hithe, or wharf, being on the Wall-

brook. St. Michael-le-Querne is another example, and some of the old street names such as Wood Street, Milk Street, Fish Street, Honey Lane, and Hosier Lane the appropriate continuation of Cordwainers' Street, probably denote rows of booths in the market-place before they were permanently settled. The butchers congregated near the western gate and the founders near the eastern.

In all these trades there were guilds, sometimes two or more in a trade. Similarity of interest united them, and as time went on and the control of wages, prices and profits became necessary in the eyes of the chief merchants, further associations were formed, and many modern historians mention 'trade guilds' as apart from 'religious guilds.' I have not, in London at least, been able to ascertain the existence of a guild which was not religious, and did not boast of a special patron in the calendar of saints. This supplies the great distinction between guilds and companies. The abolition of guilds only affected those companies which were connected with guilds, and only those estates were forfeited which had been held for 'guildable' purposes. There were some guilds more purely religious than others, and there were some, no doubt, which had no connection whatever with trade, as those already named of Holywell and of St. Lazarus, and the later associations of St. James at Garlickhithe, St. Katharine, and also Sts. Fabian and Sebastian at St. Botolph's, Aldersgate. The aldermen and city magnates belonged at first to these purely religious fraternities only, avoiding those of the trades and crafts: and it is among the unsolved problems con-

nected with London history to ascertain whether the governing guild had, as in some other places, a patron saint.

The commune established in London did not differ essentially from the commune of any other city; for the difference, where one exists, is in the process of growth, not in the result. The facts gathered in this and the preceding chapter prove nothing if they do not prove that no special single date can be fixed as that on which the 'communa' of London came into being. In many neighbouring boroughs a birthday, so to speak, could be celebrated. The town was found worthy—or wealthy enough to pay for—the establishment of a commune, and the leading guild of the townspeople was granted a charter by the king, and so became the 'guild-merchant.' It was the guild of the Holy Trinity at Windsor. It was the guild of the Assumption at Coventry. Although the Birmingham guild was not strictly a guild-merchant, it formed, or included, the commune of the town, and was dedicated to the Holy Cross. But in Winchester, Canterbury, Bristol, and some other ancient cities, including London, it would not be easy to discover the dedication of the governing guild.

The advantages which accrued to a town by obtaining a charter of franchises—'the same as the franchises and liberties of London,' as the form usually ran—was that a fixed sum was paid for 'ferm,' that the chief officials could be elected by the burgesses, that the internal government and the preservation of law and order depended on the borough magistrates, and, above all, that every burgess was a freeman and

could not be claimed by any lord or master if he had resided openly without interruption within the boundaries of the borough a year and a day.

These rights and privileges are defined as belonging to a 'commune, that is, a guild,' by Glanville, writing in the reign of Henry II., and those who deny that London possessed a commune before the commencement of the reign of Henry's son have to find some other city to answer to Glanville's description. He died at the siege of Acre in the very year (1189) which ancient tradition assigns as that of the foundation of the mayoralty. He can hardly have intended to allude solely to continental cities; and we may be very sure that if London had preceded all the cities of Europe in the establishment of guilds, it was not far behind its nearest neighbours across the Channel in seizing and adapting the communal idea. William of Malmesbury says of London in the reign of Stephen that its men ranked with the barons of the realm, and that many barons of the realm had been 'admitted to the franchise of their commonalty.'

As the guilds of craftsmen became more powerful, they pressed more and more on the aristocratic governing body. The establishment of the common council was only the first step towards the recognition of the workmen as distinguished from the merchants. Hitherto, the frith guild and its successor, the commune, as at first instituted, bound even those who did not belong to one or the other, and who had no voice at the Guildhall. But the first sign we meet of the existence of the commune is the awakening of the inferior guilds to the idea of municipal life, an awakening which,

though it caused a less violent convulsion than in the great commercial cities of Northern Europe, yet led to conflicts, political and social, which had important results. Though, no doubt, from the first certain duly qualified craftsmen were admitted to the governing body, they required a high property qualification, and a contest between the crafts and the Guildhall meant in most, if not in all, cases a conflict between the poor and the rich.

The interference of the Crown, which complicated matters during the feeble reign of Henry III., at the same time mitigated the violence of faction. As at intervals aldermen and craftsmen were forced to unite in order to prevent the king from ruining both, it was only when political strife ran very high that actual violence ensued. The slowness of municipal growth during the Barons' War gave time for a closer organisation of the guilds. London was largely concerned in the invitation to Louis of France, and even as late as 1222 an alderman named Constantine, one of several great city magnates who were the sons of Athulf, or Aluf—both forms occur—was summarily hanged for raising the cry 'Montjoye and Louis.' It has been questioned how far Earl Simon foresaw the results of his parliamentary policy, but it can hardly be doubted that Thomas FitzThomas and Walter Hervey foresaw the victory of the crafts that must follow their successful efforts at organisation. Eventually the old governing families and their successors of the mercantile oligarchy had to make common cause with the crafts, fresh combinations were formed, and the old contests were carried on under new names and by new men.

Though Rokesley and Whittington belonged to craft guilds, they were as aristocratic in their policy as any Cornhill or Buckerel of the twelfth century.

The first mayor was allowed to hold office till his death; yet, except by the regulations respecting fires, he left little mark on the history of the city. His wife's christian-name was Margaret, but we do not know her parentage. She survived him; but his eldest son, sometimes called Peter 'FitzMayor,' died in his father's lifetime, leaving by his wife Isabella Cheney a daughter and heiress, to whom much of her grandfather's wealth descended. But she had at least three uncles, Alan, Thomas, and Richard. To them estates in Hertfordshire, Kent, Surrey and Middlesex were bequeathed, but we cannot identify them as prominent citizens after their father's time. His age must have approached a century before he died. Johanna, his granddaughter, had already been twice married, and some of the best families in England are descended from her. The family mansion at London-stone was bequeathed by her son, Robert Aguillon, to the Priory of Tortington in Sussex.

Henry, the first mayor, did not survive to see the glorious day of Runnymede, but during his twenty-five years of office London figured largely in every demonstration against royal tyranny, and the first great meeting of the magnates who extorted Magna Charta from John was held in the city at St. Paul's.

The mayor died before October 1212, and was buried in the church of the Holy Trinity at Aldgate, where his father had become a canon eighty-seven years before. His successor was Roger FitzAlan or Aleyne, who must,

like Henry, have been a very old man, since he had signed documents as an alderman before the establishment of the mayoralty, and does not seem to have survived to enjoy a second year of office. Robert Serle, sometimes called 'Serlo le Mercer,' was probably the mayor of the year of Magna Charta, and in 1217, after a year's interval, he became mayor again, and retained office probably till his death. Next came Richard FitzReiner, whose father had been sheriff, perhaps 'portreeve,' between 1155 and 1170, and who therefore, like Henry and Roger, belonged to one of the old city families. He had been sheriff himself in 1189, the traditional first year of Henry's mayoralty. His successor, after five years of office, was Roger le Duc (in Latin 'Rogerus le Duc,' a curiously anomalous form), who had followed him in the shrievalty; and next, after four years, on his death in office, came Andrew Buckerel, who also died in office, and was succeeded by Richard Renger, or Fitz-Reiner, probably the same who had been mayor after Serle. He, like his predecessor, died in the mayoralty, and for the first time, in 1238, we have a possible craftsman in office. All the names above mentioned, and those of three intermediate mayors, William Hardel (1215), Jacob 'the Alderman' and Solomon Basing (1216), are those of members of the old oligarchical families. They and their fathers had been aldermen before the election of the first mayor, and before twenty-five of the common folk of the city had been called into council among the merchant princes of the Guildhall. Two of these names are worth noticing. 'Jacobus Aldremannus' occasionally witnesses early deeds; Stow calls him 'James.' He died in office and was succeeded

by 'Salomon de Basinges,' as his name is given in contemporary Latin documents, the member of a great city family, still commemorated by the ward of Bassishaw —'Basingshaw.'

The name of William Joyner seems to mark a civic revolution. He had been sheriff a few years before, and on the death of Richard he was elected mayor, perhaps only for the conclusion of the year of office. We can tell but little at this distance of time what were the circumstances which led to his election, and whether the interference of Henry III. in the affairs of the city in 1238 was consequent upon it. From this time the king harassed the city on one pretext or another for a quarter of a century; and it can hardly be a mere coincidence that in the interval only members of the old families held office. But we are on slightly firmer ground in believing that the election of Thomas FitzThomas was a victory of the craft guilds. This was the year of Earl Simon's return from abroad, and the aldermen made no secret of their preference for the king's side in the controversy. The mayor and the lower classes, calling themselves the 'communa' of the city, sympathised with Earl Simon and the barons. A convention for mutual help was signed between the Earl and FitzThomas supported by the people, and the height to which party feeling ran is shown by the insults offered to the queen when she passed London Bridge on her way from the Tower to Westminster by water. The aldermen contrived to keep the Earl out of the city at first, but an attempt made by the king to seize him in Southwark roused the anger of the people to such a pitch that they forcibly opened the Bridge Gate

and admitted him with acclamations. They sullied their hour of triumph by a massacre of the Jews, whom Henry had specially favoured. The very same year a terrible fire among the wretched structures which surrounded the market-place showed how badly the Assize of FitzAilwin was observed. As if to prove that misfortunes never come single, the very day after the burning of Milk Street and Bread Street the victory of Earl Simon at Lewes brought mourning to all classes of the citizens. The aldermen had to lament the failure of their hopes, while the common folk heard that nearly the whole of their contingent to the army of the Earl at Lewes had been cut to pieces by 'Sir Edward le FitzRoy' to avenge the insult cast upon his mother. No wonder we read in a contemporary chronicle, 'Cele an fut veu el firmament une esteile q'est apellé comete.' 'A notable blazing starre appeared, such a one as had not beene seene in that age, which rising from the east with great brightnesse unto the midst of the hemisphere drew his streame.'

Thomas was mayor again in the memorable year when Earl Simon summoned, in the name of the king, the first parliament of the modern kind. No doubt the mayor and other citizens sat for London, but the names have been unfortunately lost. The first members for the city recorded are the six who sat in Parliament in 1284, and the mayor of the year is included among them; indeed, it has sometimes been asserted that the mayor of London was, by virtue of his office, one of the parliamentary representatives of the city. In this first Parliament, which assembled, we read, in the Chapter House of Westminster Abbey on

St. Valentine's Day (1264) it was made known that the 'king had bound himself by his charter, on oath, that neither he nor Sir Edward would from henceforth aggrieve, or cause to be aggrieved, the Earls of Leicester or Gloucester or the citizens of London.'

How far Henry III. intended to be bound by this or any other oath the sequel of half a year was destined to show. Meanwhile, however, he was received at St. Paul's in great state by the mayor and aldermen, who all did fealty, the mayor, Thomas, promising, in a voice which all could hear, that so long as Henry continued to be a good king and lord to them, so long would the citizens be faithful and duteous to him.

It was not to be for long. On August 4 all London was alarmed by a mighty tempest, with 'coruscations, lightnings and thunder.' On the same day and at the same hour, as the citizens afterwards sadly noted, the champion of English liberty lost his life at Evesham. The death of Earl Simon left London at Henry's mercy; the oath he had taken at St. Paul's went for naught, and though he did not hasten his vengeance the citizens knew it was sure to come. The mayor and sheriffs found no one to receive them at Westminster when they attended as usual on their election. The king had summoned an army to lay siege to London and had called the citizens his foes.

It would be curious to speculate on the consequences of resistance on this occasion. We have one side of the story very fully detailed in the Latin Chronicle which Riley who translated it, and other authorities, attribute to a citizen of German extraction, Arnald, the son of Thedmar. He was himself an alderman and

evidently took the king's side with others of his own rank. A party, 'the fools and evil minded,' who had been 'adherents of the Earl of Leicester,' were fortifying the city, but now the aldermen had their way. Even Thomas the mayor was obliged to submit to their dictation, and terms were made with the king. The leaders of the popular party were summoned to Windsor, where the mayor and four others were imprisoned in spite of a safe-conduct, the houses and property of all who had sided with Earl Simon were mercilessly plundered. A royal official at the Tower governed the city, there was no mayor, and the sheriffs were superseded by bailiffs.

This miserable state of affairs lasted for about five years. There was no election of a mayor, but a new warden was appointed annually by the king, and the bailiffs who served under him were apparently chosen from among the aldermen. Among them were two men who came later into great prominence, Gregory Rokesley and Walter Hervey. Both belonged to old city families, and both were aldermen, Gregory of Dowgate and Walter of Cheap. Although they seem to have entertained widely divergent ideas of their duty, both had the interests of the city at heart, and were distressed at the poverty and oppression which followed Henry's victory. By accepting office under the warden they were no doubt able to mitigate the evil, and were afterwards remembered with gratitude by their fellow-citizens. Meanwhile the populace clamoured in vain for Thomas, their mayor, whose subsequent fate is unknown; and Henry did as he pleased, fining and imprisoning, forfeiting and plundering, while

the bridge and the streets were left without repairs, the laws were set at nought, and order was only kept by the intervention of the armed followers of the king's party. At length, in 1269, the king 'remitted his anger,' and John Adrian was chosen mayor, probably by royal nomination. In the following year he was formally elected, and his sheriffs were Gregory Rokesley and another wealthy alderman, named Henry le Waleys or Galeys, who figures largely in the events of the next reign. His origin is unknown, but he was probably from some place in the king's continental dominions, for the Latin form of his surname is '*Wallensis*,' and he was made mayor of Bordeaux in 1275. Comparative freedom gave the popular party courage, and at the next election they defeated Philip the Taylor (le Tayllur), who had been sheriff in John Adrian's first tenure of office, and chose Walter Hervey, whom they regarded as a successor to the ill-fated Thomas.

I have already described the condition of Cheap at this period, and it need hardly be pointed out that Walter's constituency differed materially from that by which John Adrian was elected alderman of Wallbrook or Gregory Rokesley of Dowgate. Few of them dwelt in the market-place. Walter Hervey himself had a house on Paul's Wharf, and many of the shopkeepers lived at Stepney, Stratford, and Hackney. Walter was probably brought into closer contact with the lower rank of tradespeople and with the artisans than any of his fellow-aldermen; and when John Adrian's second year of office as mayor was ended he declared himself a champion of the popular cause, and was elected against Philip, the 'mob of the city'—vulgus civitatis—

crying 'Nay, nay!' at the name of Philip. Walter Hervey's popularity was nothing new. He had long censured the magnates for their conduct as assessors of tallages, and had both made them pay up their own share and pointed out publicly that they had not done so regularly.

The aldermen appealed against the election to the king, but, fortunately for the people, Henry was ill, and Walter of Merton, who as chancellor acted for him, endeavoured to heal the strife. A warden was selected from among the aldermen to carry on the government of the city, and five arbitrators were appointed on either side, but the king's death put an end to the dispute. The aldermen acquiesced, for the sake of peace, in Walter Hervey's election, and a precious year was gained in which to carry on the work attempted by Thomas FitzThomas.

The new mayor at once set about the organisation of the craft guilds. He saw that no union could be hoped for among the conflicting interests of the different classes of workmen, but that, by forming them into separate companies, concerted action among their leaders would be comparatively easy. He gave charters, as mayor, to those craft guilds that applied to him, and it cannot be asserted that in so doing he exceeded his powers. Certainly while he was mayor the charters he had granted remained in force, though, in the contest which arose after his tenure of office was over, Gregory Rokesley assumed that they were only valid while he remained mayor. Henry Waleys, a man of the same political views as Gregory, was in Walter Hervey's room, and the aldermen applied to the council, which happened to

be sitting at St. Martin-le-Grand, and obtained a warrant against Walter, when he openly impugned their conduct. In spite of all he could do, in spite of his speedy acquittal by a jury of compurgators, in spite of the assembly of his supporters at the church of St. Peter in Cheap, the charters he had granted were forfeited, the organisation of the craft guilds was suspended, and finally, as a crushing blow at Walter Hervey's humble constituency, the booths and temporary shops were cleared out of Cheap, the reason assigned being that King Edward was coming home, and the city must be in order to receive him. To excuse this extreme step the mayor pleaded orders from the council, and Walter again withstood him to the face, denying that the council had any jurisdiction in the city, and reproving the mayor for giving up the liberties of the people. The mayor and his friends retreated to the court and concerted measures for the suppression of the demagogue. Walter Hervey was accused, before a carefully packed meeting, of various small acts and injuries during his mayoralty, chiefly, it is evident, trumped-up charges, no particular stress being laid upon his granting of charters or his complaint against the mayor. He was deposed from his aldermanry and a new election was at once ordered, Stephen Aswy, a nominee and relative of Gregory Rokesley, being elected in his place by the depopulated ward.

Walter Hervey was alive some years later, but seems to have agitated no further. Probably, when Edward returned, he saw his doctrines taken up and his views carried out in spite of the efforts of the oligarchy.

It may be worth while to pause a moment here and

observe the gradual change in personal names which marks the latter part of the thirteenth century. The use of the modern English patronymic form very seldom appears, yet 'Fitz' if it is indicated by *Filius* in the Latin writers is growing less and less common. Such surnames as Hervey, Adrian, Aunger, Thovy, are clearly patronymic, but we find them in the very nearly contemporary 'French Chronicle,' side by side with William 'FitzRichard,' and Hugh 'FitzOtes.' So too, while territorial names are still often, and indeed usually, marked by the use of 'de,' it is omitted in many cases, and we read of Adam Broning, and Stephen Bukerel, and Richard Aswy, with Gregory de Rokesley, and Richard de Walbrok, and John de Flete. In the very curious English proclamation which announced King Henry's adherence to the provisions of Oxford, 'fitz' is supplanted by 'sune,' and 'de' by 'of'; and we have 'Sim' of Muntford' and 'Joh' Geffrees sune.' A little later, as we shall see, the 'de' was used in a different sense, and denoted the city or town from which a citizen or his ancestors had come, bringing no other special surname with them. Trade names are already very common. Philip, the rival of Walter Hervey, is described as 'le Tayllur' even in the Latin Chronicle, and we have 'Walterus le Poter,' probably a bell-founder; 'Ricardus le Cofrer,' a trunk-maker; 'Haukinus le Plumer,' probably a plumber; and Ralph 'le Fevre,' a smith—perhaps a goldsmith; and many similar examples among the most eminent of the citizens. The personal surnames have almost ceased, except a few which have become permanent in certain families, as Blond, sometimes given as Wite or White, sometimes as 'Le Blount;'

'le Bole,' sometimes 'Bull,' Goodcheap, Cosyn, Corp, Bat, Box, Coton, Gos, Horn, which never appear with a Fitz or a De before them. But the more grotesque forms have died out. Good-soul, Good-Christian, and A'Godshalf, do not occur any more than 'Hugo cum dentibus,' 'Alwinus Sherehog,' 'Willelmus oculus latus,' or 'Edwardus cum barba.'

The condition of the city at Edward's return must have been very distasteful to a king of his military training. The misgovernment and confusion of his father's reign had left their mark everywhere. The handicraftsmen were enraged against the merchants, and the old families were gradually withdrawing into the country and leaving their claims to supremacy in the hands of a new class. Some of the aldermen sat by purchase, some by election, and a few by hereditary right. There was no strict rule, and only the final appeal to the folkmote, which the different parties alternately avoided and consulted, kept alive a certain amount of civic opinion and union. To Edward, the distinguishing mark of whose reign, as Bishop Stubbs observes, was legal definition, such anomalies were displeasing. Moreover in the meanwhile everywhere the streets and highways, the walls and gates were falling into decay. When the church of St. Paul's encroached on what had been the 'folk land' at the western end of the market-place there was no one to interfere; when the bridge over the Wallbrook at the eastern end fell out of repair there was no one to compel the owners of the adjoining houses to mend it. The power of the governing body at the Guildhall had been weakened, but no other body had taken its place. A special clause of

the Provisions of Oxford, as far back as 1258, related to repairs of 'the Exchange of London, and the City of London,' but nothing had been done. The guilds, of whose regulations we know very little, since the only examples which have been preserved are of much later date, continued to exist, and interfered constantly at every election, although without legal warrant or acknowledged civic position. The mayoralty was held for seven years running by Rokesley, then for three by Waleys, and Rokesley was re-elected in 1284; but the character of their rule may be learned from the lists of riots, murders, and other signs of disorder which have come down to us. The sheriffs one year were deposed for taking bribes; another year the prisoners escaped from Newgate; again, Michael Thovy, a member of one of the oldest city families, was hanged 'for murders and robberies.' It is evident, from even a cursory glance at the contemporary chronicles, that, whether from the increase of factious spirit, or from the neglect of the mayors, who were often absent on their own or the king's business, the city was ill governed and ill kept. The streets were still unpaved and unlighted. The market-place was full of putrefying heaps, and the butchers and fishmongers were constant offenders. When Gregory Rokesley was again mayor, the dean and chapter of St. Paul's obtained leave to wall in their precincts, although to do so they trespassed on the place where the folkmote was used to assemble, narrowed the roadway to the 'Cornchepyng' and obstructed the parade-ground to the southwestward, where, close to Baynard's Castle, the citizens mustered for inspection by their standard-bearer. An appropriate tavern sign may have led to the commemora-

tion of this spot in the name of Knightrider Street; but, to judge by other street names as they existed in the thirteenth century, the district close about St. Paul's fully deserved the bad character which the dean and chapter gave it when applying for the king's license. Edward endeavoured in vain to reconcile the citizens to the visitation of his judges of assize, and this year (1285) he determined, by a high-handed course, to bring things into better order.

The mayor, Gregory Rokesley, was summoned, on June 29, to attend at the Tower before John Kirkeby, the treasurer, and his brother-judges. Rokesley complied, but went, not as mayor, but as a private citizen, handing the ensigns of office to an alderman, the same Aswy mentioned above, before he crossed the civic boundary. Kirkeby was, no doubt, well instructed beforehand. He promptly 'took the mayoralty and liberties of London into the king's hand, because the city was found to be without a mayor.' A few days later a Kentish knight, named Sandwich, was appointed warden, but was specially charged 'to govern the citizens according to their customs and liberties.'

c

CHAPTER IV.

THE WARDENS.

The office of Warden—Sir Ralph Sandwich—City Improvements—The Gates—Lists of Wards—New Families—The Hundred Rolls—The Wards divided—Their early History and first recorded Aldermen—The Jews in London—The Warden of the City a Judge.

KING EDWARD had, as early as 1282, taken a first step in the regulation of London affairs by appointing his cousin, Edmund, Earl of Cornwall, to the office of 'custos pacis' in Middlesex. This 'warden of the peace' would hold, with respect to the sheriff elected by the citizens, very much the same position as a 'lord lieutenant' of later times. The strong measure of John Kirkeby, which led to the appointment of a 'custos' over the city itself, is not altogether analogous. Sir Ralph Sandwich as warden superseded the mayor for the time being, but the sheriffs remained, being sometimes selected by the Exchequer, and sometimes regularly elected, but always from among the aldermen or chief citizens.

If Sir Ralph Sandwich was related to the bishop of that name, as seems probable, his appointment may not have been wholly unpopular. Bishop Henry had sided with Earl Simon and Thomas FitzThomas, and

had been obliged to go to Rome, on their defeat, to obtain for himself the papal absolution. He died of the fatigue of the journey, so it was said, soon after his return in 1273. Sir Ralph appears to have been received without open opposition, and it is very probable that the disorganised condition of civic affairs, the confusion which survived the misrule of Henry III., the anomalies discovered by the commission of which the results are embodied in the Hundred Rolls of the second year of Edward—all these things, working together with the external pressure of the king's want of money and the internal decay of public works, made his semi-military government welcome to the better sort of citizens. Sir John Breton occasionally superseded Sandwich, and the two alternately held the wardenship from 1285 to 1298. The writer of the 'Liber Albus' makes a kind of formal protest against this violation of the city liberties, but neither there nor elsewhere do we hear of any high-handed acts of oppression, and the wardens seem to have scrupulously obeyed the king's injunction 'to preserve the city of London and all its liberties and ancient customs unhurt in such manner as from of old they had been used to enjoy the same.' They avoided mixing themselves up with either faction, but seem to have never taken any important step without consulting the principal citizens. Several changes and improvements originated in their time, and the corporation in its modern form may, in many particulars at least, be said to date from the rule of the wardens.

The streets, and especially those which led down to the river, had to be cleaned, levelled, and kept in order;

the course of the 'Walebrook' was cleared, and every house from the Moor to the Thames was furnished with a 'rake,' to prevent the stream from being polluted; the bridge which crossed the brook at Bucklersbury was repaired by the tenants of the four adjoining houses, as had long before been arranged; four persons were sworn in to seize pigs found wandering in the streets; boats were forbidden to moor along the Thames bank except at the appointed hythes. Regulations were made as to markets and shops, as to weighing-machines, as to noxious manufactures, as to sanctuary in churches, nay, as to the dress of the citizens and their wives. The warden even condescended to notice such a matter as the muddy condition of Chancery Lane, near the extreme western boundary of the extra-mural suburbs, and to make regulations for its improvement.

Besides these ordinances there were others more strictly military in their character. In 1296, London was called on to contribute to the general defence of the kingdom and a long correspondence ensued. Nothing can more clearly show the moderate character of the rule of the wardens. Edward's precept enjoined the Londoners to send men-at-arms for the defence of the southern coast under his son, Edward of Carnarvon, afterwards Edward II. At this conjuncture Sandwich was constable of the Tower, and Breton warden of the city. Some opposition was made to the king's wishes, and both Sandwich and Breton attended in the Guildhall and were met by fifty-two of the citizens, headed by sixteen of the aldermen. Some concessions as to prisage having been granted, the king's request was acceded to and a formal letter of assent was written. From

time to time regulations were made for the security of the gates. One of Sandwich's first cares on coming into office was the assignment of certain gates to the men of certain wards, and a little later he ordered that each sentinel should be armed 'with two pieces; namely, a haketon and gambeson, or else with a haketon and corset, or a haketon and plates.' The haketon was a stout leathern jerkin, and there were periodical inspections of each citizen's armour.

These regulations respecting the gates naturally led to the definition and regulation of the wards, and one of the first cares of Sandwich was to arrange for the due keeping of the records at the Guildhall. The Letter Books, the first of which (Letter Book A) begins with 1275 and ends with 1296, are from this time regularly kept, and though they contain much which is of minor interest, such as 'recognizances' and other personal entries, they also afford valuable historical notes. The warden very early conceded, with the king's consent, that even under his government the citizens were not to be impleaded out of the city boundaries; but he insisted that the sheriffs should see that the pleas of the hustings be duly enrolled, and should provide clerks for the purpose. On the morrow of every hustings court the pleas were to be read before the mayor, the recorder, and at least four aldermen. The first of the Letter Books contains more than one list of aldermen. On folio 116 we have a list of the wards by name, the first list of the kind, and probably entered here to mark a new arrangement. Twenty-four wards in all are enumerated with their aldermen, and it is interesting to compare it with other

but less complete lists of an earlier period, some of which I have already mentioned.

We perceive at once that the governing families had changed, and were constantly changing. We have no longer a few surnames repeated over and over again. The Cornhills have gone, and to find them we must seek in the annals of Surrey and Sussex, where many of the name appear as sheriffs in the thirteenth century. The descendants of Thovy have come to a disgraceful end; the Bukerells are long extinct. It is difficult to say what became of many of these old families. Some of them migrated into the country and forgot their city origin as lords of rural manors, and, in many cases, no doubt, barons in parliament. We miss the posterity of the first mayor, the descendants of Berenger, of Vyel, of Hervey, of Aleyne, the Bats, the Dukes, the Hardels, the Haverells, and the Boccointes. In their stead we have a great preponderance of territorial surnames, pointing, not to a migration of country squires or their sons to London, but rather to a custom of distinguishing each candidate for the citizenship and the inestimable privileges attaching to it, by the name of the place from which he had come, perhaps as an apprentice. In some cases, no doubt, an old-fashioned family name was dropped, in others a trade furnished a convenient distinction. It is but seldom we meet with a name derived from a city residence. The last Cornhill—assuming that the name was derived from the ward, and not, which is possible, that of the ward from the family, and that of the family from some country place, such as Cornhill in Northumberland—was Stephen, sheriff in 1284; and in 1306 we meet with Geoffrey 'atte Condytt,' and Ralph

'de Honylane,' both in a Latin document. But such examples are rare. For the most part the city magnates of the end of the thirteenth century are called in contemporary writings, chiefly Latin, by such names as De Storteford, two of whom, John and William, were sheriffs together in 1297; De Glocester, De Aumesbury, De Dunstaple, De Fulham, De Hallingbury, De Suffolk, De Hereford, De Staines, De Canterbury, and others which are evidently not old family names but convenient descriptions, and in every-day language had 'of' or 'o'' instead of 'de.' But after this time the number of what may be distinguished as city families declines steadily, to undergo a partial increase centuries later when banking houses became hereditary. We no longer see a succession like that of the Basings or the Blounts, of the sons of Athulf or the Frowyks.

The inquisition reported to us in the Hundred Rolls shows that London was not yet definitely divided into distinctly separate wards as late as 1274, and that the wards which existed were still often known by the names of the aldermen who ruled in them. Cheap, Portsoken, Dowgate, Wallbrook, Bassieshaw, Langborne, and Coleman Street are mentioned separately; but of them only Cheap and Portsoken are usually so described. We can, however, identify most if not all the wards, and find that they were twenty-four in number, answering to the modern divisions, except that one of the two great wards of Farringdon was held by Anketill 'de Auvenue.' William Farringdon purchased the aldermanry of the ward from John le Fevre in 1279. This fact, which is not open to much doubt, shows how unsettled the boundaries must still have been. As Ralph le Fevre

the father of John appears in 1274 to have been alderman of Cornhill, yet to have bought Newgate and Ludgate in 1277, he must either have held both or been transferred from one to the other; and this accords with what we know of Cornhill, which belonged to the bishop as his soke, and was sometimes refused a place among the wards— refused leave, that is, to elect an alderman. As late as 1320 it is not mentioned. This was exactly the kind of anomaly which King Edward's wardens came into the city to remove, and, whatever may have been the case afterwards, Cornhill was a ward in the time of Sir Ralph Sandwich. Before this period the ward boundaries were indefinite, and the ward names, with certain marked exceptions, were unsettled.

The names of the wards, as settled and recorded in Letter Book A, are practically the same with those now in use, except in a few instances. The two wards of Farringdon Within and Without were united when William Farringdon purchased Holborn and Fleet Street from Anketill de Auverne; the ward which we call 'Langbourne' was then called 'Langforde,' and Broad Street was 'Lodingberi.' With regard to these and the other names a few notes may not be amiss.

The name of Castle Baynard, or Bainard's Castle, belonged to a tower or bastion of the city wall which was situated at its south-western corner. A little higher up was another but smaller tower, Montfitchett's. Both were called after their Norman tenants. Bainard's name occurs in the Middlesex Domesday in respect of some land which has not been identified. He died in the reign of William Rufus, and was succeeded by his son Geoffrey. The castle belonged in 1111 to William

Bainard, by whom it was forfeited to the crown, together with the lordship of Dunmow in Essex. Both were granted soon after to Robert, a younger son of Richard, Earl of Clare, and his son Walter held it after him and died possessed of it in 1198. The next inheritor of Baynard's Castle was the FitzWalter who figured so largely at Runnymede, and who led the citizens on their disastrous expedition to Lincoln in 1217.

It is necessary, since I have selected Castle Baynard as a typical example of the growth of a ward, to go into all these particulars, as they tell on its history and vicissitudes. There is a legend in many of the books about the reasons for the enmity which subsisted between John and FitzWalter; but as no two narrators agree on the facts, and as there was quite enough in FitzWalter's political conduct to account for what happened, we need not go into it. John caused FitzWalter's houses and castles to be dismantled and destroyed, and among them this one of Castle Baynard; but before his death FitzWalter was restored to his possessions. I have sought in vain for any proof that this restoration included a rebuilding of the tower or castle; but it is assumed by all writers on the subject, with the result of falsifying the history of a very interesting place. If we assume the contrary, and conclude that the destroyed tower on the wall was never rebuilt, we shall find that all the difficulties of the opposite view are dissipated. The soke which the successive barons of Dunmow held, to which the office of standard-bearer of the city was annexed, and which was situated in the south-west corner of the city, comprised the parish of St. Andrew, neither more nor less,

and this parish extended further westward than it does at present, to the city boundary in fact, which at that time was the line of the wall, running due south from Ludgate to the Thames. Meanwhile the Tower of Montfitchett fell into the FitzWalters' hands. The last of the Montfitchetts was dead, and an enquiry before a jury in 1276 proved that at the time of his death he no longer owned the tower, and that it did not pass to his heir, but that it belonged wholly to Robert FitzWalter.

In this same year, 1276, the Dominican or Black Friars bought or begged this south-west corner of the city for a new house, instead of the place of their first settlement in Holborn. There was some dry land now at the mouth of the Fleet which had not been dry when the wall was built, and Archbishop Kilwardby, himself a Dominican, exerted all his power and influence to obtain the site. Lord FitzWalter gave him the Tower of Montfitchett and the site of Baynard's Castle, and Gregory Rokesley induced his fellow aldermen and others concerned to let the friars block up two lanes 'next the street of Baynard's Castle' to make room for their church. Nor was this all. They were allowed to pull down the city wall from Ludgate to the river, and to make a new wall which would take in their house. There was thus, as it were, created a new precinct in the city, and part of the wall which went round it was discovered lately; the ward boundaries are, however, a sufficient guide to the character and dimensions of the change. The new wall ran westward from Ludgate down the hill to the Fleet, and southward along the Fleet to the Thames.

The barons of Dunmow continued nevertheless to claim and enjoy the rights attached to their soke, which had been expressly reserved, and it was not until 1347 that it was formally decided that these rights interfered too much with the liberties of the citizens to be longer conceded. There was a ward which may be identified as Castle Baynard already in existence, however, as early as the beginning of the twelfth century. If we look at the map we see that even when the precinct of St. Paul's is taken out on the north, and the parish of St. Andrew by the Wardrobe—being the soke of Lord FitzWalter—on the west, there still remain the parishes or parts of the parishes of St. Mary Magdalen, and St. Benet or Benedict, Paul's Wharf. These fragments formed a ward as early as 1111, for though no name is given to it we have it mentioned in what seems almost if not quite the earliest of all the dated documents discovered by Mr. Maxwell Lyte at St. Paul's. It relates to a holding which Robert 'de Verli' had enjoyed close to the church of St. Benedict 'super Tamisiam.' It was now let to Robert's brother, Hugh, for eightpence a year, and the lease is signed and witnessed by William the dean, by several canons, by Philip the son of Robert de Verli, and by many other laymen, including 'Turstenus aldermannus de la warde.' Tursten is not mentioned in the 'terrier' or list of the lands of the dean and chapter which contains the names of so many alderman before 1115. He was probably dead by the time it was made, but as the land of Hugh de Verli is mentioned without the name of any alderman or ward, it is possible that either the aldermanry was vacant, or that as 1111 was the year of William Bainard's forfeiture, the new owner

of the castle may have asserted rights in the ward which superseded those of an ordinary alderman. In any case Tursten is the first alderman of a ward in London of whom so far any mention has been found.

Mention is also made in one of these early documents of a 'soca episcopi' as being in Tursten's ward. In this same year 1111 'Leuricus' holds a house and land near the Thames in the bishop's soke, and Tursten witnesses a lease relating to it, as alderman. The bishop's soke must be taken here to signify Paul's Wharf, and as there was an alderman it is evident that the bishop's jurisdiction was not such as was claimed on Cornhill. A little later Leuric (Leofric) still holds the land, but we have no mention of Tursten or any other alderman; this was about 1115, but Leuric is called 'prepositus.' It may not, therefore, be going too far if we assume that Leuric was alderman of the former ward of Tursten, and, when this document was written, happened to be portreeve, for 'prepositus' was one of the Latin forms for reeve after the Conquest, and refers, as Bishop Stubbs has pointed out, to the ancient leet jurisdiction.

Of Tursten, or Turstin, we have a few other particulars. His wife's name was Wlveva. She had a son named Gilbert, apparently by a former husband, and another son also named Gilbert by Tursten. This appears by a grant which Tursten made of the 'land which belonged to Wlveva, and on which she dwelt,' to the canons of St. Paul's after her death for the health of her soul. This grant is made with the consent of Tursten's step-son, or son-in-law (privignus) Gilbert, who also signs as a witness together with another Gilbert described 'as Gillebertus filius Wlveve.' A little

later this land, described as having formerly belonged to Tursten, is leased for a mark a year, by Ralph (the dean) and the canons to 'Walter the son of the bishop.' The name of this Walter 'filius episcopi' appears in several of these old grants, from one of which we gather that he was a priest and connected with St. Paul's, probably as a canon.

After Tursten's time no alderman of the ward has been identified until we come to 'Paynus de Edelmeton,' who was succeeded by Robert Basing. As Basing was alive in 1290, we may suppose that Payne of Edmonton's date is about the middle of the thirteenth century, or a hundred and fifty years after the time of Tursten. The FitzWalters resisted the jurisdiction of the alderman, and it is possible that there was an occasional interregnum.

Besides the soke of the standard-bearer and the obscure soke of the bishop, there is now included the precinct of St. Paul's, but even as late as the time of Stow, it was reckoned in Farringdon. The ward boundary on the north side is exceedingly irregular, but its irregularities can all be accounted for. The bishop's palace and the deanery stood originally to the north-west. Old Deans Lane (Elde-denes-lane) is often mentioned in very early writings. This was the outlet for the dwellers in the precinct towards Newgate; and accordingly a long piece of ground on one side of what is now Warwick Lane extends almost to Newgate Street. The ward boundary runs parallel to the old site of the cathedral church, cutting off the 'Petty Canons' and the modern chapter house, which are both later than the settlement of wards. On the eastern side the boundary follows the wall of the precinct, but the angle formed

by the junction of the north side and east side is cut off, or blunted, so to speak, and this shows us the old direction of the Watling Street at the point at which it emerged from Cheap.

The map, therefore, shows us first Castle Baynard before the reign of John. The parish of St. Andrew, with the castle and the two towers on its western side, is the soke of the standard-bearer. The parishes of St. Benet and St. Mary Magdalen form the ward of Tursten. The precinct of St. Paul's is to the northward, and forms the parish of St. Gregory.

Next we have the ward with the soke of Lord Fitz-Walter included, but with the Black Friars' House covering the sites of Baynard's Castle and Montfitchett's Tower, and extending beyond them westward to the Fleet. Thirdly we have the modern Blackfriars' quarter, belonging, not to the ward from which it was originally taken, but to Farringdon Within, by an arrangement made in the reign of James I.; and the precinct of St. Paul's added to Castle Baynard.

Only one thing more has to be mentioned. In 1428, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester built a house by the river-side in the ward of Castle Baynard, and this house, which is mentioned by Shakespeare and by many other writers, is usually, perhaps I should say always, confounded with the original castle of Bainard and FitzWalter which was not even in the same parish. I have dwelt at some length on the history of this ward, partly because it has been the subject of an unusual number of unfortunate guesses and unfounded statements and partly because its gradual growth is so easily traced. It is also interesting on account of its offering



THE WARD OF CASTLE BAYNARD

us such full particulars as to the significance, in London, at least, of the term 'soke,' and because Tursten is the first alderman of a ward whom we can identify.

Aldersgate was always an influential ward as the headquarters of the goldsmiths. The name is unquestionably derived from the gate, which was one of those erected early in the middle ages, but subsequently to the Roman period. The name of Ealdred, may well be that of some contemporary of Alfred, perhaps the first settler in the district, and 'Ealdredesgate' is named in the laws of Ethelred. William the Mazener was alderman under Sandwich, and was probably a goldsmith who mounted drinking-vessels of pottery or wood, called mazer-bowls, of which many examples of a later date still exist, with gold and silver and jewelled ornaments. There is a very early mention of 'Aldredesgate' in a deed witnessed by 'Henry de Lundonston,' mayor of London, but undated, relating to land near the church of St. Agnes. A common but later form was Aldrichgate. When, in 1287, Sandwich made the ordinances as to the defences of the city gates which I mentioned above, he assigned Aldersgate to the care of this ward with those of 'Bassieshawe' and 'Colemannestrete.' The earliest alderman of the ward of whose name we can be sure is John Blakthorn. He was in office in 1274 and long afterwards; but before 1115 there is mention in the documents at St. Paul's of 'Warda Brichmari monetarii,' which is probably Aldersgate.

The history of the ward of Aldgate would need a volume to itself, if only to notice and refute all the nonsense that historians have written about it. The name, spelt 'Alegate' in a document at St. Paul's,

which must have been written before 1115, is derived from the gate, and in quite modern times has been usually spelt 'Aldgate' instead of Alegate or Algate. The insertion of the 'd' is consequent on a mistaken idea. Stow first, and after him Stukeley, called it 'Ealdgate.' If this had ever been its name it would now be Oldgate, not Aldgate, just as Old Street, St. Luke's, was anciently Ealdstreet, and is still so called in the name of a prebendal stall in St. Paul's Church. The ward of Aldgate lies wholly within the line of the wall; and it is interesting to observe, as evidences of the existence of bastions, two places where, at Aldgate itself, and again a little to the south, near America Square, there is an irregularity in its otherwise very straight outline.

In the regulations made by Sandwich for the defence of the gates, Aldgate was assigned to the care of the men of the wards of William de Hereford (Aldgate), Nicholas de Winton (Langbourne), Robert de Basinges (Castle Baynard), William de Hadstock (Tower), Portsoken and Wallbrook. Either, then, these were not very populous wards, as seems most likely, or Aldgate required a larger number of sentinels than Aldersgate, which, indeed, was probably at this time little more than a postern.

The earliest alderman of Aldgate whose name can be identified is John of Norhampton, who had been sheriff under Thomas FitzThomas; he was alive when the entry was made as to the names of the wards, and was probably succeeded in the same year by William of Hereford.

The ward of Bassieshaw unquestionably takes its

name from the Basing family, who owned the 'haw' in the thirteenth century. It seems probable from its situation that this was part of a small park or wooded district which long survived in the middle of the city. Bassieshaw is remarkable as the smallest ward in the city, and as being very nearly conterminous with the single parish of St. Michael. It is also remarkable for the number of public buildings which formerly stood within its boundaries, indicating its open condition to a comparatively late period. A map of the ward of Cheap shows that when the new Guildhall was built about this time, and possibly as one of the consequences of the wardens' rule, the ground on which it stood was taken out of Bassieshaw. When the hall was enlarged, probably in the reign of Henry V., the boundary then fixed had to be crossed, and as a consequence the modern Guildhall is partly within Bassieshaw. This 'hammer-headed' projection of the ward of Cheap is very instructive to the topographer. The ward is very early mentioned by name, but the first alderman of whom we can be certain is Ralph le Blund, or Blount, who governed it under Sandwich. In the Hundred Rolls return it is called 'Bassingeshol,' a form which justifies 'Basinghall Street.' The alderman's name is not given.

The name of Billingsgate must refer to the individual or family who at the Saxon settlement colonised this part of the river bank. To seek any other meaning for it would be absurd. The Billings are met with in other places, and we have Billingshurst, Billingsley, Billington, Billinghay, scattered all over England, besides Great and Little Billing in Northamptonshire.

The gate may have been a harbour in the bank, or an opening in the wall, with a water-gate. The wall was built along the river by the Romans, and Fitz-Stephen, writing in the reign of Henry II., speaks of it, but says it has been eaten away by the tide, so that we cannot tell when it was destroyed. The harbour is mentioned in the laws of Æthelred: 'Ad Billingesgate, si advenisset una navicula, unus obolus thelonei dabatur.' There are further regulations, showing that all kinds of ships landed their goods here. In the ordinances of 1287 the ward of Billingsgate is named as concerned with two others in the safe keeping of the gate of London Bridge. John Sperling is the first alderman whose name I have identified. It occurs in 1216, and that of Ralph Sperling in 1241, a clear case of hereditary succession. There is a 'warda Sperlingi' in or before 1115, and a little later Jordan, the son of Sperling, was an alderman.

The ward of Bishopsgate comprises a large district without the line of the old city wall, a district which must have been added after 1212, when the ditch outside the gate was widened. It is curious that no London historian should have told us when this great suburb became part of the city. Bishopsgate was to be guarded by the men of four wards in 1287, those namely of Philip the Taylor (cissor), which must have been Bishopsgate itself, of Cornhill, of Lime Street, and of Robert de Arras, which was Lothbury or Broad Street. In addition, it was kept in repair by the merchants of the Steelyard, or Hansa, of Germany, and they are specially mentioned in Letter Book A: 'Per homines Danorum ita quod essent in

medio et homines wardæ inferius et superius;' that is, the men of the 'Danes' were not to be trusted, except with the men of the ward above and below them. I have seen no other passage in which these merchants are described as Danes, nor have I been able to connect any home or foreign event of the year 1287 with the special distrust here shown; but it may be that the expression 'homines Danorum' refers to soldiers hired by the Steelyard, and not to the members of the Hansa itself. Philip le Taylor is the earliest alderman of Bishopsgate whose name I have been able to identify.

Bread Street Ward consisted of the western part of Cheap, where, from a very early period, bread was sold. I have few particulars of its history, and, so far as I am aware, its mention in the list in Letter Book A is the first distinct notice that has yet occurred. At this time Anketin de Betevile was the alderman. In 1287 the ward is spoken of as his, and he is the first in the list of aldermen before 1320. In a document at St. Paul's, already referred to, there is a 'warda Radulphi Filii Algodi' which may be this, as the church of St. Augustine is named, as well as Fish Street, the 'street of the market,' 'vicus fori,' and a narrow street in which is situated the house of Herlewin, who may be identified in several other documents relating to this quarter. That it is not Cheap is certain, because that ward is separately mentioned. Although the church of St. Augustine, Watling Street, is in the ward of Farringdon, the greater part of the parish is in Bread Street, and there was probably some alteration of the ward outline when the course of the ancient Watling Street was altered, which must have been at the

rebuilding and extension eastward of St. Paul's Cathedral.

There have, as is well known, been three London Bridges: that built by the Romans, which probably crossed between St. Botolph's Wharf and the site of the Bridge House near St. Olave's Church; that finished by Peter, curate of St. Mary Colechurch, in 1207, which stood a little higher up, reaching from near the church of St. Magnus to Sun Wharf; and the modern bridge, still higher up the stream, finished in 1831. Of these we may presume that the second accounts for the form of Bridge Ward on the map, as it extends, on either side of Fish Street Hill, from the site of the Bridge Gate northward to Fenchurch Street. The Roman road from the bridge perhaps led up by Botolph and Philpot Lanes to the recently discovered site of the Roman gate in Camomile Street. The houses on the bridge were divided into three precincts. Four guilds 'de ponte' are mentioned as 'adulterine' in 1180. The alderman of Bridge Ward in Letter Book A is 'Joceus le Achatur' (the buyer?), whose predcessor was John Horn. The care of the Bridge Gate was assigned, of course, to the ward with the help of Billingsgate and Dowgate.

Broad Street Ward is probably referred to as 'Warda Haconis' in the St. Paul's MS. already quoted, both because that ward contained a certain holding from which Gilbert 'Prutfot,' the sheriff, had ousted the dean and chapter, and which is described as near St. Margaret's Church, and also because it contained the land of Albert 'Lotering.' In the Guildhall list it is 'Lodingeberi,' showing that the mansion or 'bury' of

Albert was still remembered or actually existed. Is Hacon the alderman still commemorated by 'Hackney'? The alderman in the Guildhall list is Robert de Arras, whose predecessor was William Bukerel (Lansdowne MSS. 558). The men of this ward joined in the care of Bishopsgate.

Candlewick Street is a ward which lay on the Watling Street, and its name has given rise to much fruitless conjecture. It appears to be identical, in part at least, with the modern Cannon Street, and the question arises whether the wax-chandlers, the canons of St. Paul's, or some faint reminiscence of a royal high-road, a 'cyning's street,' gave it a name. Coney Street in York occurs to one's mind, and in a map of 1604, by Ryther, it is called 'Conning streete,' but there are too many curiosities and anomalies of spelling in Ryther's maps to give this any authority. It seems more probable that the chandlers, who unquestionably did live and work here, gave their name, as the cord-wainers and other crafts gave theirs, to the street and ward they most inhabited, and it is referred to in a deed at St. Paul's earlier than 1187 as 'Candelwrich strete.' Hollar writes it 'Canwicke' Street, and Stow, contemporary with Ryther, 'Candlewick' or 'Candle-wright.' In the Guildhall list it is 'Candelwy,' and Ralf de Basinge is the alderman. He had succeeded a relative, perhaps his father, Thomas de Basing. I cannot identify it with any of the wards named for the defence of gates in 1286, but forty years earlier it is the ward of John FitzAdrian.

From the very first appearance of documentary evidence the ward of Cheap has been so called. It is

one of the three mentioned by name in the St. Paul's list, so often referred to above, as being of the early part of the twelfth century. Could we be sure that the boundaries of the ward were never changed, its modern form would give us a plan of the ancient 'Chepe,' the market-place of Saxon and Norman London. The outline of the ward on modern maps shows that it has been repeatedly modified. The precinct of St. Martin-le-Grand, the boundaries of the 'soke of St. Paul,' the new Guildhall removed from Aldermanbury are all sharply marked; and it is possible, or probable, that the increase of a permanent population on what had once been the open market-place caused its division into Bread Street, Cordwainer Street, Candelwick Street, and the 'Warda Fori.' This division must have been made before the time of Sir Ralph Sandwich, but there are many indications that it was comparatively late. Even before 1115 it is the 'Forum,' 'Warda Fori.' The aldermanry was elective at a very early period, and the alderman must always have been an important personage in the city. In the Guildhall, as in the Lansdowne list, Stephen Aswy, alderman of Cheap, comes first. The only alderman of Cheap before Stephen Aswy whose name I have been able to find is Walter Hervey. When the market-place became covered with permanent habitations and the population grew in proportion, it was divided into wards which can hardly have been of the same kind as those which had their origin in estates or sokes. It would seem probable that the wards in Cheap were the first in which the election of the alderman by the inhabitants was the rule, and we consequently find few traces of the hereditary succes-

sion common elsewhere. Henry le Waleys is the first alderman of Cordwainers' Street whose name occurs. The ward was the headquarters of shoemakers and hosiers. The street is now called Bow Lane, and the ward must have been taken out of Cheap.

Coleman Street appears in the St. Paul's list as 'warda Reimundi,' and this is the more interesting as we know that Reimund, or Reinmund, was dead before 1115, which helps us to date the document. Azo, his son, succeeded him. The alderman of the Guildhall list is John FitzPeter, whose predecessor, according to the Lansdowne list, was 'Elyas Russel.' Elias Russell, who was mayor in 1299 and the following year, can hardly have been the same, unless there is some error in one or other of the lists. No Russell or Russel occurs as alderman in the Guildhall list. This ward was told off, by its modern name, to garrison Aldersgate in 1286. The probability that Ceolmund, an early sheriff, or portreeve, gave his name to the street is considerable.

The ward of Cornhill is very small, but comprised a soke belonging to the Bishop of London, and apparently there was some dispute as to the jurisdiction of an alderman within its limits, as, though Cornhill is named in Sandwich's list, it is omitted from that of the Lansdowne MSS. about 1319. It occurs however in the regulations as to the gates, where its men are told off to Bishopsgate. The formal claim of Bishop Eustace de Fauconberg and its recognition by the citizens in 1228 are detailed in the 'Liber de Antiquis Legibus.' By Sandwich, fifty years later, such an arrangement would, as a matter of course, be brushed

aside, and there was still an alderman of Cornhill in 1312, but in the later and less orderly years of the reign of Edward II. the bishop may have been able to revive his claim so far as to prevent the appointment of an alderman. The name of Cornhill has been a fruitful subject for conjecture. It is not impossible that the family of Corenhell or Cornhill, which figures so largely in the annals of John and Henry III., may have conferred their surname on the ward; but against this must be put the form in which it once occurs in 1125, when 'Edward Hupcornhill' and other aldermen went into the priory of Aldgate and became Augustinian canons. At any rate, I have found no proof of Stow's conjecture that it was called from a corn market. The corn market of London was by the church of St. Michael 'le Querne,' at the other end of Cheap, and near the bread market. The 'Corncheaping' is often mentioned in documents of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but it never means Cornhill. Stow mentions an old house decorated with the royal arms as being traditionally 'King John's.' It adjoined Pope's Head Alley. Was this the site of the residence of the Cornhill family? On the famous occasion of the deposition of Longchamp, John was lodged at the house of Richard FitzReiner, the fellow-sheriff but political rival of Henry de Cornhill. The existence of the bishop's soke, no doubt, gave rise to the curious legends as to the antiquity of St. Peter's Church and its connection with the apocryphal bishops of Roman London.

The ward of Cripplegate seems to be mentioned in the St. Paul's list as that of Alwold, because 'Aldresmanesberi' is included in it. A little later 'Jukell'

signs as alderman. There are floating traditions of a ward of 'Aldermanbury,' which probably relate to Cripplegate. In 1200 William de Haverhill was alderman. In the Guildhall list Henry de Frowick is the alderman. The guardianship of the gate is assigned to the wards of Cheap, Queenhithe, Vintry, and 'warda Johannis de Banquell,' that is, the ward of Cripplegate itself, in which Banquell had succeeded Frowick. The gate, if it existed before the Norman conquest, must have been a mere postern. The church of St. Giles is known to have been founded about 1090, and the hospital of St. Bartholomew may account for the cripples who, according to every tradition, habitually assembled here. The ward known as 'Cripplegate Without' is under the same alderman. The local names recall the Barbican, the bars at the Red Cross, the Postern at Postern Lane, the Monkswell, Everardswell, Goldingswell (Goswell), and other features which have long disappeared. Stow remembered the remains of the old Guildhall in Aldermanbury, though he is mistaken in supposing that the new Guildhall was first founded in 1411. The word 'bury' seems in London always to imply a mansion, and we must look upon Aldermanbury as the site of the first meeting-place of the civic fathers. 'Adel Street' is another interesting name in this ward. It is very early called 'Atheling Street,' and a whole treatise might be written upon it and upon 'Goderun Lane,' now Gutter Lane, and the church of St. Alban in Wood Street. The newly discovered documents at St. Paul's go to confirm the truth of much that has hitherto been condemned as mere unfounded romance.

The name of Dowgate recalls an opening in the river wall which fell before the time of FitzStephen. Stow talks of 'Downgate,' and other writers of 'Dourgate,' but I have seen no satisfactory explanation of the name. The Wallbrook ran out at Dowgate, and the ward may be that described as 'Brocesgange' in the St. Paul's list, though Wallbrook itself seems best to fit the name. The Steelyard stood in this ward, and the foreigners undertook to keep Bishopsgate in repair; but the men of this ward kept watch at the Bridge Gate. The great Gregory Rokesley is the first alderman whose name seems certain.

Of the two Farringdon Wards I have spoken frequently, yet something more remains to be said. In 1393 they were formally separated. There is no more instructive outline than that of Farringdon Within. It stretches from the market-place at St. Peter's in Cheap westward to Newgate; this portion must be what is frequently referred to as the 'ward of Newgate.' From Newgate, again, it stretches in a southerly direction, along the crest of the cliff above the Fleet, to Ludgate. This is 'warda de Lodgate.' The precinct of Blackfriars, added in the reign of James I., brings it to the Thames. The exact position of the mediæval Newgate is marked by a bend in the outline on the map, and the courts and gateways of St. Martin-le-Grand define its eastern boundaries. A long narrow strip in the ward of Aldersgate, now known as Foster Lane, formerly Faust, Fast, Vast, or St. Vedast's Lane, marks the avenue of access from St. Martin's to the Cheap. A similar avenue, as mentioned above, forms a limb stretching from St. Paul's northward towards Newgate. This was the way from

the precinct of St. Paul's, and seems to belong to a time when there was no exit for passengers at Ludgate. The corner at Blackfriars shows the great concession obtained by Archbishop Kilwardby for the Black Friars, when they were permitted to pull down the city wall and set it back. In 1277 it was the ward of Ralph le Fevre, probably a goldsmith, who held it by grant from Thomas Arden, at the annual rent of a 'clove of gilliflowers.' It had belonged to Thomas Arden's father Ralph Arden, and had been let to Anketill de Auverne. The Ardens were by this time country squires and knights, and we may have here another example of the emigration of a wealthy city family. William Farringdon bought it from John, Ralph's son, two years later. It included Farringdon Without, or Holborn and Fleet Street. Of the 'ward within' Adam Bruning was alderman before Anketill or Ralph, and signs a deed at St. Paul's about the year 1260.

In the document I have so often quoted as containing a list of the lands of the dean and chapter before 1115, there is mention of 'Porta Huberti,' which I am tempted to identify with Ludgate, and of the region 'ultra Fletam,' to which, however, no alderman is assigned. The earliest alderman whose name can with any certainty be connected with Farringdon Without is 'Joceus filius Petri,' who seems to have entered on his office when a settlement was made between the city and the abbot of Westminster, whose possessions at one time certainly extended to the Fleet. By 1222, the year of the compromise, it is plain that a street had grown up along the road between Ludgate and the site of the later Temple Bar. At a more remote period, before the

building of the so-called Fleet Bridge—where now is Ludgate Circus—and while Ludgate itself was, as its name imports, a mere postern opening on the steep cliff above the Fleet, the natural exit of Londoners westward was along the Watling Street, through Newgate, over Holborn Bridge, and for those who had business on the Strand of the Thames, down Show-well Lane, now Shoe Lane. This Holborn suburb, extending from the street of Holborn, southward to the Thames, was partly on the land of the prebend of Holborn, near St. Andrew's Church, and partly on land which belonged, or had belonged, to the Abbey of Westminster. We find Joce FitzPeter alderman as early as 1223, or immediately after the settlement. He had been 'sokereve' of St. Martin (le Grand), and in 1211 had served the office of sheriff. He was still alive in 1240, soon after which time Laurence de Frowyk is alderman of the ward. Frowyk was sheriff in 1246 and again in 1251. The Farringdons, Within and Without, were finally separated in 1393.

The ward of Langbourn is mentioned as Langford in an early list. There is some obscurity as to the meaning of the name. Stow speaks of a certain 'long borne of sweete water,' which ran nearly parallel to Lombard Street and turned south at 'Shirebourn' Lane. It is remarkable that this should in all probability be the exact site where we might expect to find traces of the fosse of the first Roman stronghold. Some modern topographers describe this as the ward of Langbourn 'or Fenny about.' Stow, however, more accurately calls it 'Langborne and Fennie about.' The ward is in fact divided into two detached portions, the western

being about Lombard Street and the eastern about Fenchurch Street. 'Langeburne' appears in the Hundred Rolls. The alderman was Nicholas de Wynton, who was still in office when Sandwich's list was made.

The ward of Lime Street contains a small part of one side of the street from which it derives its very ancient name—a name for which, so far, no very intelligible explanation has been offered. The area of the ward is extremely small, and is almost covered by Leadenhall Market; but a narrow strip runs northward up St. Mary Axe to the neighbourhood of the wall. There is at present no church in the ward. The first alderman whose name I have met with is Robert de Rokesley, who was probably a near relation of Gregory the mayor.

Of the Portsoken it is not necessary that I should say anything more than has already appeared in Chapter II. above, except that the nunnery of the Poor Clares or Minoresses was taken out of the ward in 1295, and its site is still reckoned as not within the city boundaries.

Queenhithe, like several other wards along the bank of the Thames, is remarkable for its small size, which points to an early density of the population. The landing-place was at first called Edred's hithe, but, having come to the Crown, it was given by Henry III. to his queen, and various regulations were made to force merchants to land their wares there. They resulted chiefly in adding to the unpopularity of Queen Eleanor; and the city, after some negotiations, obtained in 1246 a grant of the hithe from Richard, Earl of Cornwall, to whom it then belonged, at the annual

rent of 50*l*. Simon de Hadstock is the first alderman in Sandwich's list. But in a document at St. Paul's relating to the church of St. Michael 'Wluardus prepositus' and 'Hugo aldermannus' are reckoned among the parishioners before 1138; and in a still earlier document, written before 1115, we read of 'wards Hugonis filii Ulgari' and of 'terra Wluardi' which was held by William Malet. Mr. Lyte has printed a very ancient, but undated, lease or agreement which is witnessed by 'Ulgarus aldremannus,' by 'Lyvestanus' and by 'Alxi,' all three of them portreeves. In 1287 Queenhithe was appointed to guard Cripplegate, with Vintry, Cheap, and the ward of Cripplegate.

The Tower or Tower Street Ward is called after William de Hadstock in the list at the Guildhall as to the regulation about the gates, where 'Alegate' is assigned to it. The same alderman is the first mentioned in the list of 1320, and I have not been able to identify any earlier name. In the lists of wards in Letter Book A it is called 'Warda de Turre.'

Vintry is another small riverside ward. Its name is, no doubt, derived from its having been the headquarters of the French wine trade. John Wade was alderman before John de Gisors, who figures in the Guildhall list. The names of two aldermen before 1222 occur in the MSS. at St. Paul's. Andrew Fitz-Peter is the first, and is succeeded by Martin FitzAlice.

Walbrook, properly Wallbrook, is probably mentioned as 'Brocesgange' in the list at St. Paul's before 1115. The 'Wall' is, of course, what remained of the western fortification of the original Roman London, under which the 'Brook' flowed. It was very early

bridged over, and the ward lies on both sides of it. Several churches are known to have been built on arches across the stream, one, St. John the Baptist, being actually described as 'upon Wallbrook.' John Adrian is the first alderman whose name I have identified. His successor was Thomas Box, alderman under the wardens. In the regulations of 1287 as to the gates, 'warda de Walebrock' is one of those charged with the custody of 'Alegate.'

In the foregoing notes I have endeavoured to put together all I could find about the early history of the wards, avoiding, in most cases, what has been published before. It is possible that further investigation may identify all the nineteen mentioned in the list at St. Paul's, to which such frequent reference has been made; but for my present purpose it is sufficient to have shown that until the time of the wardens, Sir Ralph Sandwich and Sir John Breton, there were many anomalies in the ward regulations, aldermen could alter boundaries, several exempt sokes still existed, and there were numerous traces of hereditary succession. From the date of the list which occurs in the oldest of the Letter Books at the Guildhall, a date which I am tempted to fix as 1287, the boundaries have, with few exceptions, remained the same until the present day, the succession of aldermen has only been broken in the case of Cornhill, and the whole character of the city constitution was changed. From the tenor of the regulations as to the gates, which is dated in the fifteenth year of Edward (1287), it is evident that a military object was to be attained; and, as a matter of course, all the old separate jurisdictions and private

sokes were to be discouraged, as endangering the safety of the city.

It was during the rule of Sandwich that the Jews were expelled. In London the Hebrew colony was large and wealthy, and we have a mention of the 'street of the Jews' in some of the oldest extant records. It is a question whether they were in London before the conquest: yet the Jewry was in the ward of Haco or Hacon (afterwards Broad Street) before 1115, and seems to have been reckoned later within the boundary of Coleman Street, the adjoining ward. In or before 1150 we find the dean and chapter of St. Paul's willing to grant land in fee to 'Benedict the Jew,' and the deed is witnessed by Abraham the son of 'Sanson.' The same Benedict is mentioned repeatedly, and there can be no doubt of the wealth of many members of the colony. In 1189 the coronation of Richard I. was the occasion for a massacre of the London Jews, but its principal perpetrators were punished. A very few years later the Jews are as prosperous as ever, and about 1197 the dean and chapter grant a lease for ever of some land in the parish of St. Lawrence to Peter Blund, a Jew, and Miriam his wife. The ground, like most of the ward of Cheap at that period, was probably vacant: but the Jews were already remarkable for their skill in building, and theirs are among the oldest stone houses we hear of, not only in London, but in other cities. The Jew's House and Aaron's House, at Lincoln, are among the earliest examples known of English domestic architecture. Moyses Hall, at Bury St. Edmunds, was another; and Ralph of Coggeshale speaks of the Jews as building houses like kings' palaces. Some time before 1207 Herbert of

Antioch, whom we may assume to have been a Jew, sold his stone houses in Milk Street and Honey Lane to the dean and chapter, and they were re-granted to William Joyner, who about thirty years later was mayor. But a still more interesting name is connected with another Jew's house. There are, as is well known, but scanty materials for a biography of John Wyclif, but among them are some records of a suit in which, as master of what was then called Balliol Hall, he was engaged. They are still preserved at Oxford, where they were catalogued and described by Riley in 1874. The tenant of a house near the church of St. Lawrence Jewry in 'Catte Street,' afterwards Cateaton Street, now absorbed in Gresham Street, refused to pay his rent to the college on the ground that the house had belonged to his uncle, Adam de Horsham, to whom it had been leased by the king. Wyclif gained the suit by showing a good title to the house, but it comes out in the pleadings, that it had been built by 'one Thippe,' a Jewess, the wife of Isaac of Southwark, 'and after the exile of the same Thippe from England, it came into the hands of King Edward.' Nor is this the only mention of Jews' houses in the archives of Balliol. In or about 1287 there was a conveyance to Hugh de Vienne of the rent of the holdings of 'Cresse, son of Cresse, the Jew,' of Roysia Duceman, and of Roysia Tuyte, all in Milk Street, and described as the houses of certain Jews. Another 'Cresseus' was the son of 'Master Elias the Jew,' and had himself a son Leo, who lived in Ironmonger Lane, in the parish of St. Martin Pomery. In 1261 a deed of gift recites the names of another Leo the Jew, of Aaron the Jew, and of the above-mentioned Benedict, all of

them resident in Milk Street. Benedict's house after the exile is let to John Brewer. The master and scholars of Balliol had also property in Oxford, which had belonged to the Jews, including their Synagogue. It is evident from these notes, which might be considerably extended, that though the Jewry was situated on the north side of Cheap, it was not very strictly circumscribed, that the members of the colony suffered from no special disabilities in acquiring land or houses, and also that they participated in the custom of the city as to married women's property, a custom but lately extended to the whole country.

It is not possible now to ascertain the number of the Jews who were resident in London. Any estimate founded on the number massacred or judicially slaughtered at various times would be misleading. Their cemetery was beyond Aldersgate, a long way from the Jewry; it is mentioned as subject to a rent of twelvepence yearly in 1270 and is commemorated by Jewin Street. Their Synagogue stood in Lothbury at the corner of Old Jewry, but it was destroyed in one of the periodical riots in 1262, when it is stated that 700 Jews were killed. The site was given to the Friars of the Sack, an obscure order subsequently suppressed: and at the time of the expulsion the London Jews do not seem to have had any fixed place of worship.

The treatment of these unhappy people under Edward I. is in singular contrast to the general character of his rule. They were fined on every conceivable pretext. They were forbidden to lend money at usury, probably to induce them to take out special licenses. They had to wear a distinctive dress. Proselytes were

rewarded at the expense of their brethren. In 1279, on an accusation of clipping the coin no fewer than two hundred and eighty men and women were hanged on one day. In 1287 the whole Jewish colony throughout England was seized to the number it is said of 15,000, and 'held to ransom.' By this transaction Edward obtained 12,000*l.*, an enormous sum in those days. Finally in 1290, the king issued his decree of banishment, permitting them to carry away their movables, but ordering them either to renounce their religion or to leave the country within three months. There has been much inquiry of late as to the number who emigrated. Sixteen thousand is the usual estimate: but if the whole number seized in 1287 was 15,000, and if there were, as is sometimes asserted, a large number who preferred Christianity to exile, a serious discrepancy exists in these figures. As a fact, however, it is impossible to place much reliance on any mediæval statistics, either as to population or as to the number of houses in a city and the number of deaths during an epidemic.

This exile of the Jews was the last event of importance under the rule of the wardens, unless we assign special significance to the fact that in 1289 Sir Ralph Sandwich was sworn in as a justice of the King's Bench although he retained office as Warden of London. This appointment may have had some bearing on the future position of the mayor. In November 1291 Sir John Breton took his place, but in the following year Sandwich was back. In 1293 Breton commenced a four years' incumbency of the wardenship, and in 1297 the mayoralty was restored.

84714

CHAPTER V.

THE MUNICIPALITY.

The Municipality complete—The Civic Offices—Their origin traced—The Lord Mayor—The Chamberlain—The Coroner—The Recorder—London under Edward II.—The Accession of Edward III.—Southwark granted—The first Chartered Companies—The Livery—Recapitulation—The Municipality not of Roman but of English origin.

THE last years of the reign of Edward I. showed the value of the reforms and regulations of the wardens. The stability of the municipal constitution was sorely tried in the reign of Edward's feeble successor, and, although now and then it failed to bear the strain, on the whole the citizens had reason to be satisfied with it. We may safely assert that, had the troubles of the time of Edward II. come upon London before Sir Ralph Sandwich and Sir John Breton put things in order, the misfortunes of the city would have been far greater than they were, perhaps even overwhelming.

The chief municipal officers were now appointed, and what was for ages the civic procedure in legal and other business was settled. The machinery was a little complicated perhaps for the time but it necessitated the check of constant records, and from that day to this we have an unbroken series of documentary evidences,

many portions of which have been published of late years. At this point therefore we pause to examine the actual outward form which the civic government assumed. Some few of the municipal offices underwent a change after this period, and others were not yet in existence, but before proceeding to notice the influence which the institutions of the city of London had upon other English cities, to speak of the mercantile growth and its visible consequence in the extension of suburbs, and to bring forward some of the causes and results of London's paramount political position, I am anxious to make my foundation as broad and as deep as the materials within my reach will allow. I do not suppose that any apology will be thought necessary for this course, because if I ask the reader to refer to other books, including my own, on this great subject, it will be seen that it is only within a year or two past that any accurate information could be obtained as to the origin and growth of the government of London and its officers. One thing is, I presume, abundantly clear: the theory of a Roman origin of the municipality must be given up. The municipality of London contains no elements which have not come into existence since, at the furthest, the reign of King Alfred; few, indeed, which are not much more modern.

A division of the city offices into those which are annual and those which are permanent can hardly be made, as all are held only during pleasure of the citizens, and most are subject to at least the formality of annual election. The distinction may, however, be drawn between those in which the election implies a change and those in which it only signifies approval and confirma-

tion of a former appointment. It is but rarely that the mayor is elected in two following years, and it is as rarely that the chamberlain or remembrancer is not chosen again and again. The ultimate powers of the citizens have been questioned many times, but have always been eventually acknowledged. There is only a single example between the time of Richard II. and Charles II. for the removal of a mayor during his year of office—that of Reynardson in 1649. But aldermen, though elected for life, have been frequently deposed. There is a rule against the election of sheriffs a second time, and even in their year they may be superseded by the civic vote. For the dismissal of almost all the officials whom we habitually look on as most permanent there seems to be authority in the past. If therefore we would distinguish two classes of civic functionaries we must divide them not into the elected and the permanent, but into those who are annually changed and those who remain in office during pleasure.

The office of mayor has occupied so much space in these pages, that it might be thought there is nothing more to be said. A special significance has often been supposed to belong to the first assumption of the title; but there is the same obscurity, and the same room for guesswork, in the early history of the mayoralty at Bristol, at York, and other ancient cities. At Winchester, for example, there was a mayor in or before 1199, yet he is not named in a royal charter more than sixty years later. Under the three Edwards, the mayoralty was still in its infancy; and the rank of 'Henry le Waleys, mayor of the city of London,' whom the citizens elected on the restoration of their electoral

rights in 1297, was very different from that of Whittington, or Frowick, in the fifteenth century. Yet it is significant of his increasing importance that Edward held a parliament in the house of Waleys at Stepney, where he was staying in 1299 to arrange for the marriage of the prince, afterwards Edward II., with Isabella of France. The rich coffers of the citizens were no doubt the attraction, as on a former occasion eight years before, when the king visited the same house to negotiate a loan for the Scottish war. The title of 'Lord' which begins to be attached to the mayoralty about this time has been the subject of much inquiry, but there is good reason to doubt if it was ever formally conferred; and we frequently meet with the Latin 'dominus' at so early a period as to have caused several mayors to be spoken of as knights, in translated passages, long before Sir John Blount, in 1306, the first whose knighthood is certain. I think we may be sure that the mayor of London has been addressed as 'my Lord' ever since such a form has been applied in English to any subject, and certainly ever since he was constituted one of 'the Judges of Oyer and Terminer and gaol delivery for the gaol of Newgate,' in the first year of Edward III.; though this was only the recognition of an ancient right, as is somewhat obscurely acknowledged in the charter itself. The title of 'Lord Mayor' probably rose out of the other usage, but we do not find it habitually employed, even as late as the time of Stow, who, writing at the end of the sixteenth century, never uses it. That it is of great antiquity is, however, evident, for Richard II. specially granted a similar title to the Mayor of York, in 1389, at the same time giving,

it is said, 'his sword from about his side' to be borne before him as Lord Mayor. I have not been able to ascertain when the sword was first borne before the mayor of London; but it is probably a very ancient usage, not necessarily connected, as some have supposed, with his rank, but rather with his office. The mayor of London must have had the title of 'Lord' by custom earlier, and I think it will be found to occur as early in his case as in that of any judge or other functionary. In the assessment of poll-tax which led to Wat Tyler's rebellion more than seven years before the grant to York, the Mayor of London is ranked, and taxed, as an earl, and the aldermen as barons. It is to be observed that the earliest English chroniclers seldom use the title. It occurs, however, in the Grey Friar's Chronicle (Camden Society) in 1535, and it is just possible that the friar applies it as an extra mark of honour to Sir John Allen, who was that year sworn of the Privy Council. At first the Mayor was always included among the city members; and at the opening of Parliament, the representatives of London sit on the ministerial bench. At present the Lord Mayor is always styled 'Right Honourable,' and there can be no doubt, in spite of the opinion of a late Clerk of the Privy Council which has recently been published, that whether he has or has not a right to be present at the first Council held after a demise of the Crown, he has invariably from time immemorial been present at it; and, as is well known, the late Duke of Wellington insisted that no business could be transacted till the Lord Mayor had arrived.

Sir John Allen gave a gold collar to be worn by his

successors, no doubt with the king's assent. A few years before, at the funeral of Henry VII., the mayor took precedence next after the Lord Chamberlain. This was, of course, out of the city; but within his own boundaries—as, for instance, at a State ceremonial in St. Paul's—he comes after the sovereign only. In commissions of Oyer and Terminer he is even named before the Lord Chancellor. This and other regulations can hardly be referred to the thirteenth century, but it is convenient to notice and dispose of them here so far as I can.

As to the election of a mayor, the usage has differed at different times. Among the wardens' reformations it is probable we may count the rule under which the election of the mayor was to be made by the commonalty rather than by the tumultuous assembly of the folkmote. In the reign of Edward IV. a further change was made, and ever since the livery—which did not exist as a body much earlier—at a court of common hall, held in the Guildhall, select two aldermen, one of whom is finally chosen by the court of aldermen. The custom of continuing the mayor in office for several years was almost universal at first; but Farringdon and Chigwell gave offence to their fellow-citizens in the reign of Edward II. by accepting a royal commission to remain in office during the king's pleasure; and in 1319 it was resolved, and a charter obtained to the effect, that 'the mayor of one year cannot be mayor in the year that follows, unless perchance he is most urgently pressed to continue in office and of his own free will consents.' At the same time, the outgoing mayor is not discharged of his office until his successor has been approved by the sovereign. This approval has been signified by the Lord

Chancellor ever since the reign of Henry III., and the new mayor was sworn in before the barons of the Exchequer at Westminster, or, failing them, before the Constable of the Tower. The present usage, as there is no longer a separate Court of Exchequer, is that the elected Lord Mayor attends before the Lord Chief Justice in his court in the New Law Courts, part of which stand actually in the city. In 1354 Edward III. granted the mayor, 'for the increase of the honour of the city,' that maces of gold or silver might be carried before him, a privilege of great significance at that time. The whole subject of 'mace-bearers,' 'serjeants at mace,' 'esquire bedels' and 'serjeants-at-arms' would be involved in any discussion of the grant, but the mace-bearer of the city is 'an esquire by virtue of his office,' as is the sword-bearer.

The offices of chamberlain, coroner and escheator were at first held with the mayoralty, and the Lord Mayor is still nominally coroner and escheator, but acts only through deputies. The duties of the chamberlain were fiscal at so early a period that it is not always possible to distinguish him from the portreeve, the 'prefect,' the 'vicecomes,' or whatever title described the official who accounted at the Exchequer for the annual 'ferm' of the city. Gradually, however, the duties involved in the care of the civic funds monopolised the time and attention of an official whose title was 'treasurer of the Common Chamber,' or cofferer, or simply chamberlain. In London, as at Canterbury, at Winchester, and many other places, he was the treasurer, by whose hands all the income of the city was received and all payments made. He

also acted like a Lord Chancellor, being the official guardian of the orphans of citizens, and having the custody of their lands and money. For this purpose and others he was deemed in law what was called 'a sole corporation,' and 'a bond or recognizance made to him and his successors was recoverable by his successors.' Incidentally many other offices were discharged by him, besides those which have in course of time become obsolete. He has still, however, the charge of the city apprentices, who can only be punished when refractory by his sentence. A small 'lock-up' is provided, and still exists in his office, and a prison, seldom occupied, is still to be found near the site of Bridewell.

The recorder, the common clerk—now called town clerk, I do not know why—and the common serjeant all seem to take their origin from the rule of Sandwich. About the last named there is an entry in Letter-book A, to the effect that Gregory Rokesley, Stephen Aswy, and ten other aldermen, with the sheriffs, Thomas Romeyn and William 'de Leyre,' elected Thomas Juvenal to the office of common serjeant in 1290. This curious name occurs in the city more than a century before, when we read of a Richard Juvenal and his son Abel, a goldsmith. The common serjeant is the official law adviser of the common council, as the recorder is to the mayor. The first recorder known was Geoffrey Hartpole, alderman of 'Candlewyk,' elected in 1304. The duties of the office of coroner, like those of the chamberlain, were separated from the mayoralty at the same time. Gregory Rokesley continued to be coroner after the mayoralty was taken from him, and the office, though sometimes held by an alderman who had passed

the chair, does not seem to have been again united with that of mayor. Gregory's successor was Matthew Columbers, who also held the office of chamberlain. Later on, sometime after the reign of Edward II., they were finally separated.

London, thus reorganised, became at once in reality, if not in name, the capital of the kingdom. The part played by the city in the later years of Edward I., and throughout the whole reign of his successor, belongs to the history of England. The year of the restoration of the mayor was that of Wallace's rebellion; the king was in great want of money, and the payment of 23,000 marks, which the citizens made on the occasion, no doubt both influenced the result and also increased the power and importance of the city. The growth of commerce was indicated by the first distinct mention of livery companies, and by the settlement in London of representatives of the great Italian banking-houses. The people turned out to welcome King Edward, perhaps on his second marriage, and organised a procession according to their trades; and it has been asserted that a charter was given to the Fishmongers about this date. No such charter is now forthcoming; but unquestionably the work of Walter Hervey was bearing fruit in the gradual formation of voluntary combinations of traders for the regulation of prices, and in obtaining the recognition of the Guildhall authorities.

The strength of the city was tried to the utmost in the troubles which followed almost immediately on the accession of Edward II. In addition to the weakness of the king, it had to suffer from a scarcity of food, and the mayors of the time, John Wengrave, Hamon of

Chigwell, and Nicholas Farringdon, increased the misfortunes of the people by their contentions. The king made and unmade the mayors at his pleasure. Rioting went on at frequent intervals. The king attempted to lay a tax on the city, which was strenuously resisted as contrary to its liberties, and a voluntary loan was obtained with difficulty. The pledges entered into by those who could not pay at once are still to be seen in one of the Letter-books at the Guildhall. Queen Isabella was, strange to say, always popular, and the ultimate deposition of Edward was as much brought about by the hostility of London as by any other cause. A strong city force was with the army which took Leeds castle, in Kent, in 1321, and avenged the governor's insult to the queen by putting him and twelve of his comrades to death. The city also contributed to the army which Edward led against the Scots in 1322, and his failure, with the subsequent acknowledgment of Bruce's title as king, added largely to his unpopularity. Chigwell and Farringdon continued their contests for power, and John Wengrave is specially denounced in the contemporary chronicle as a man who did much evil in his time to the commons. Swords were forbidden in the city—a significant fact; but the mayor was not able to prevent the frequent riots, and the old hatred of the Jews was now directed against the Lombards, as the Italian bankers were called. The death of Earl Thomas of Lancaster, who was regarded as a martyr, and the subsequent popular attempt to obtain his canonisation; the flight of Mortimer, who had been shut up in the Tower; and the retirement of Queen Isabella to France, taking the young prince with

her, are among the events which tried the temper of the citizens during the short remainder of Edward's reign. When it was reported to them that the queen went about in the dress of a widow they greatly pitied her, we are told, and there can be no doubt that, in spite of the efforts of Chigwell to restrain them, the success of her expedition in 1326 was mainly owing to the support she received in London. The adherents of the Despencers were murdered in the streets, and the Dominicans were turned out of their new house on the river's bank on account of their having sided with the king and his nominee, Chigwell. These and many other disorders went on for a year, by which time the Despencers had been slain and the king shut up in Kenilworth Castle.

The accession of Edward III. is an event with which we are only concerned in so far as it affected the constitution of the city. The young king, or Isabella and Mortimer in his name, immediately granted the citizens a new charter, in which the mayor was made a 'Judge of Oyer and Terminer and gaol delivery at Newgate,' and the city jurisdiction was extended to take in Southwark, which is spoken of as a village. It was granted to the city 'in ferm,' to be accounted for at the Exchequer by the sheriffs in the same manner as the ferm of Middlesex and at a payment of 10*l.* a year. Though Southwark did not become a 'ward without' till long afterwards, this was the last addition made to the city boundaries, for, as we shall see presently, all increase, north, south, east or west, was prevented by the ring of ecclesiastical estates which surrounded London.

As the territory of the city was thus for the last

time extended, so the 'finishing-touches' were put to the municipal organisation. In 1327, the year of the accession of Edward III., charters were granted to three of the livery companies—namely, the Goldsmiths, the Skinners, and the Linen Armourers, otherwise called Merchant Taylors. Although the companies are thus for the first time fully recognised by the Crown, the organisation of the trades had been progressing steadily for many years, and during the whole of the reign of Edward III. the practice of reading and approving regulations went on in the Guildhall. In 1363 thirty-two 'misteries' were recognised, most of which, and many others besides, eventually blossomed out into full-blown companies of the modern kind, having become wealthy enough to obtain royal charters. We find, however, few, if any, traces of companies formed for the purpose of carrying on trade. The 'mistery' met for a different purpose, and was composed of men who traded each on his own account.

One thing more only was now wanted to complete the constitution of the city. In the reign of Edward II. the first step had been taken towards that completion, and citizens were obliged to enrol themselves according to their trade or 'mistery.' This regulation was embodied in the same charter which ordained that the mayor should only serve for a year, and those freemen who belonged to no trade had to seek the assent of the commonalty in the hustings. Practically therefore from the year 1319 every candidate sought admission, at first, probably, to a trade guild, and afterwards to a company, in order to acquire the freedom of the city in the easiest way. So universal did this become

that various writers have imagined that none but tradesmen could hold the franchise, a mistake on which Dr. Brentano, led by Herbert, founds an argument as to the preponderant influence of the crafts, and as if admission to a trade guild became necessary; but all have been led astray by the inaccurate use in the older books of such terms as 'guild,' 'mistery'—generally misspelt 'mystery'—'trade' and 'company.' A reference to the charter itself shows that a loophole was left for the admission of those residents who were not engaged in any commercial pursuit. That, practically, every citizen, as the most direct method of obtaining the franchise, did join a company is to be gathered from a new rule made by the commonalty half a century later. In 1375 the commonalty passed an ordinance by which the powers of the 'livery' were increased, and the Common Council was to be elected by it alone. Here, again, Herbert enlarges on some vague expressions of Norton, and a host of errors have crept in; all that can be asserted being that the companies became gradually so powerful that for a time they even superseded the wardmotes; and that, after many vicissitudes, the matter was held to have been settled by an Act of Parliament in 1475, which practically confined the franchise to the livery, but retained the powers of the wardmotes in certain particulars. The changes and struggles thus briefly referred to have never been adequately detailed, and we have to depend on incompetent authorities; but enough has been said to show that, from the middle of the fourteenth century, the livery—that is, the members of companies—were the preponderating power in the city. It is strange that

any doubt should exist on such a point as this; but though the views of Norton and Herbert have almost always, and especially in some late controversies, been accepted as correct, it is worth while to observe that they were called in question by the late Serjeant Mereweather, who had unequalled opportunities of finding out the truth, since he held for several years the office of Town Clerk. 'It is a curious fact,' he stated before the Royal Commissioners in 1854, 'that the Act of the 11th George the First, which is generally supposed to have confirmed an Act of the reign of Edward IV. giving the franchise to the livery only, does not in point of fact give it to them, but assumes that they have it.' In short, this learned lawyer and historian seems to have even doubted that any Act regulating this question was passed in 1475. Other eminent lawyers gave evidence on this occasion, and it seemed to have been established that the confusion consequent on an ignorant interpretation of the act of 1475, led the corporation in 1725 (11 Geo. I.) to obtain a second Act, by which the confusion was made worse confounded. Only for these Acts it was generally held that there is nothing within the power of the corporation of London which is not within the power of the common council: in other words, that only for these Acts the common council would have been free to reform its own procedure, or the procedure of the whole corporation or of any part of it, or to grant the franchise to the companies or resume it. In short, when Walter Hervey reproved the mayor in 1274 for resorting to the king's council for help in the city, he knew more of the civic liberties and law than did his successors either in 1475 or in 1725.

At the present time the operation of Acts of Parliament is almost as great in the city as in the suburbs: the legislative powers of the common council are in abeyance except in the smallest matters, and but for the historical fact that such an ancient body survives, the matter would hardly be worth dwelling on so long.

In the constitution of the City of London, then, from the middle of the fifteenth century the outward form has been but little altered; the municipality was thenceforth complete, and, with a few minor differences, much what it still is. We know now how it grew up and what it is, and can go on to trace the course of events which have made London the greatest and wealthiest, as it was already the freest, city in England. In the foregoing pages a wide and strong foundation has, I hope, been laid, and we have traced from the first stone the growth of the edifice which now bears the largest superstructure of its kind in the world.

There are several reasons why this growth should be recorded, even in a small book like the present, with as much minuteness as possible. It has never been done before, for one thing, because the documentary evidence has not been available. Most writers on old London—and I may perhaps reckon myself as one of them—have had to be content with what Stow could tell them, supplemented by the records published by the late Mr. Riley. But we have now, in Mr. Maxwell Lyte's calendar of the manuscripts at St. Paul's, a series of evidences which takes us back to a period when the corporation, so to speak, was still an infant—nay, beyond that point to a period when as yet it was unborn. There is great need of certainty in many

particulars still. But the broad facts are plain. We can listen no longer to any theory of the Roman origin of our municipalities, because we can take the most ancient of them, the municipality on which all the municipalities of England were avowedly or tacitly moulded, and we can, by what in ethics is called a process of abstraction, reduce that elaborate institution to its original dimensions—the dimensions, namely, of the government of any English country community, with its hustings, answering to the hundred mote elsewhere, and its association of sokes, elsewhere usually called manors, kept together by the existence of the wall. There is no difference between the government of this aggregation of urban manors by the portreeve and the government of a shire by the shirereeve, other than is caused by the accidental influence of geographical situation. When London became the seat of government for the whole kingdom, when the wealth of the citizens enabled them to control the course of history, the greatness, political and actual, of London required that its governing machinery should work smoothly, that its powers should be defined, that its magistrates should be as free as possible from external control, that the voice of the citizens should be heard clearly, and not clearly only but constantly, so that sudden tumults should be avoided; and from these needs grew, bit by bit, precedent by precedent, the municipality as it is presented to us in the days of Edward III. The portreeve, who was able to govern and to keep the city account with the king, and who sought counsel from the aldermen or lords of the manors which composed his government, and beyond his aldermen from the

citizens in their mote, gradually resolves himself, as it were, into his component parts. When he can no longer bear the heavy burthen of the reeveship by himself he is changed into a mayor with sheriffs. When his office is no longer to be held year after year by the same man he again divides, and becomes mayor, chamberlain, coroner, recorder and sheriffs. The process might be traced much further, but the only thing I am anxious to establish here is that, granted the ordinary constitution of any English hundred or any English shire of the smaller kind, and the corporation of London as it now exists may be shown to have grown out of it without a break. To deny this of London is to deny it of any and every other place in England. If London has a Roman municipality, the government of Dorsetshire or Sussex is Roman. If we concede it for one, we must concede it for the other, because all sprang from the same source, and can be traced back to the time when they were absolutely alike. The point of departure, the place where the history of the country and the town diverges, is the establishment of the communal idea as a working principle. This may have come from abroad, and it is all but proved that communes existed in the cities of the Continent before London had adopted the name of what in reality it had enjoyed, like any country village, long before—the right of every freeman to a voice in the management of affairs. The mayor and the commonalty differ more in name than in anything else from their predecessors, the portreeve and the hustings. The large influx of foreigners after the Conquest is sufficient to account for the foreign ideas—ideas which tallied so well with the native doctrines of individual

freedom that they were adopted without those tumults which devastated continental cities on the like occasion. The first charters refer back to 'the customs of London,' the law-worthiness confirmed to it by William as existing of old, and the subsequent changes came gradually, as the growing wealth and population made government more and more difficult and complicated. The small foreign element in the constitution of London, then, rather emphasises than diminishes the strictly English character of the root from which it sprang.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

CHAPTER VI.

LONDON AND MIDDLESEX.

Suburbs—The Grant of Middlesex—The Estates of the Church—The Domesday Survey—Settlement of Essex and Middlesex—Sheriffs of Middlesex—London Landowners, T.R.E.—Albert the Lotharingian—Alwin—Deorman of London—Wards Without—The Prebends of St. Paul's—Emancipation of Serfs—Westminster—Tyburn—Kensington—Chelsea—Finsbury—Jurisdiction of the Sheriffs—Southwark—Bridge Without.

FROM the days of Tacitus, London has been remarkable for the greatness of its suburbs. The question of their defence has recurred again and again at frequent intervals. Here we may well admit, if we seek for a Roman feature among the municipal institutions of our own day, the existence of a problem which Suetonius could not solve when he left the defenceless city to the mercy of the Iceni, and which has remained unsolved till now. The unknown emperor who, in the fourth century, drew the protection of his wall round villas and tombs, orchards and fields, did but acknowledge and postpone the difficulty. Similar attempts were made in after ages by successive kings and generals, and by the citizens themselves, but without any lasting success. The growth of outlying districts has eluded their efforts, and neither the extension of the civic boundaries nor

the prohibition of new buildings, neither neglect nor care, neither desertion nor protection, has availed to stop it. There have been many attempts made to control the growth of the suburbs; and though all have hitherto failed of their main purpose, some have led to valuable results of another kind. Politicians seldom learn from history, but a detailed and impartial account of these failures would be full of instructive experience for legislators.

Without touching on modern questions, or attempting to point a moral, it is still possible to trace the history of one—and perhaps the greatest—of all these experiments. I have mentioned the grant which Henry I. made to London of the farm of Middlesex. If we could estimate the reasons which led to this grant with any degree of certainty, we should understand better what the citizens expected to gain by it besides rights of jurisdiction. As this would be exceedingly difficult now, it may suffice for us to judge of it by the results, and to inquire as to the means by which they were brought about. The citizens had an old, but as far as we know undefined, claim upon Middlesex. King Henry acknowledged its validity, but the time was past when it might have been of use. It is not theorising too much to assume that after the Danish wars Middlesex required a fresh settlement. London within its walls had defied Cnut, but Middlesex—I say nothing of Essex, or Kent, or Surrey, or any other district—Middlesex was ravaged and harried in such a fashion that we cannot be far wrong if we believe that the citizens had an opportunity which was never likely to recur. If Cnut had granted the county to the

citizens the whole course of our history would have been changed. London as the county town of Middlesex, the Londoners as the chief landowners, their tenants as the colonists of a fallow but fertile tract, might have wrought great things. We have no evidence that they knew of the existence of such an opportunity. Whether I am right or wrong in thinking that it ever did occur, is now of little importance. One thing at least is certain: by the time of the accession of Henry I. the opportunity had gone by, and passed out of the region of practical politics, perhaps out of that of profitable historical inquiry. An examination of the citizens' names in the Domesday return might throw some light on the question of the influence of the city on the county before the Conquest; but by the end of the eleventh century another influence outweighed that of the city; and the final result of Henry's grant must be attributed chiefly to the 'dead hand' of the Church. Once more, when the influence of the Church itself appeared to be dead, the city and its people tried to limit and control the suburbs by including them within their own lines of defence; but the powers which had belonged to the Church in the thirteenth century were wielded in the seventeenth by laymen, and the last serious attempt to make of London in reality as well as in name one city, within one boundary and under one authority, came to nothing. It is curious to remark that rights acquired in the middle ages, as we call them, and nominally abolished at the Reformation, should again and again have asserted themselves, and should survive to account for the anomalous relations which still exist between London and its suburbs.

The suburbs grow because trade grows. The influences of which Tacitus wrote are still at work; but the land on which the suburbs stand was all, except a few acres, Church property, and to this fact alone we may ascribe it that what is now a vast, but heterogeneous, confederation, has not become a kingdom in itself, with identical interests and aspirations, and with transcendent power, through its concentrated wealth and population, over all the rest of England.

The grant of Middlesex came too late if its intention was to give London a greater power of control over the suburbs. Nevertheless, the condition of the county in the eleventh century, the position and wealth of the Church considered as the chief Middlesex landowner, and the meaning and nature of the grant, are subjects of which we should like to know more. But here we can obtain very little help from books. Too much rather than too little has been written about London history. Yet we have no analysis of the Domesday of Middlesex; we have no adequate account of the diocese of which St. Paul's is the Cathedral Church; and we may inquire in vain for a definition of the position and duties of the sheriff who acts for the citizens in their subject county. This is the more strange because Middlesex affords the sole example in England of a district held as a Greek city held its '*περίοικοι*,' a German city its 'untherthanen,' or an Italian city its 'campagna.' There must have been advantages to accrue from the payment by London of 300*l.* a year, a sum which, small as it seems to us, was a heavy tax in those days. We may be sure the willing citizens expected to obtain correspondingly valuable liberties. The Sheriffs of

Middlesex— every London burgher, that is—henceforth found themselves in possession, so to speak, when disputes arose between king and people: there was a certain income from the courts which may eventually have been greater than the rent: the military protection of the city was rendered more easy when its civil jurisdiction extended so far beyond the walls, and the right conceded to the citizens to hunt in their surrounding forests formed the outward symbol of the completeness of their rule—a symbol which signified more under a Norman king than at any time since. To recognise the customs and laws of the city itself; to allow the ancient assemblies, the husting and the folkmote; to sanction the election of magistrates by the still unincorporated burghers; all these things were of importance, but the grant of Middlesex was more than these. It was a proclamation to all England that under the king London was a free city. The time had not yet come when the internal regulations of a single walled town could matter very much to other walled towns. The people of Lincoln or of Canterbury were in ignorance as to the peculiar liberties of London: and if one came out to tell of them his words might seem but idle tales; but the farm of Middlesex was a fact which could not be disputed. It was known to all who cared to know anything of English law and civic liberty. On this account, if on no other, Henry's grant was valuable to the citizens. For centuries every influence the Crown and the Church could bring to bear was directed against it, with such unremitting industry that at the present day little except the name is left; yet year by year the citizens still assemble and assert their ancient rights;

and when they choose the two sheriffs for their own city they charge them each to fulfil also, on alternate days, the duties which used to devolve upon the Sheriff of Middlesex when he was appointed by the king.

It may be well, before we proceed, to remember one thing. That London is not in Middlesex, that it never was in Middlesex, that ages before Middlesex was thought of as the name of a people, a kingdom, a county, a district, or what you will, London had looked out from its watch-towers upon the wild woods of the northern hills, is a fact of which we have to be constantly reminded. When Henry, a century after the last Danish foray, gave to London the appointment of the sheriff of Middlesex, there were probably few parts of England more scantily populated. If we go back a little we can see that of all the settlements of the Saxons in Wessex, in Sussex, in Essex, there was none so inconsiderable, so obscure. Middlesex had never been thickly inhabited. When the East-Saxons were first converted, as Bæda tells us, the church of St. Paul's was their bishop's cathedral, and London their 'metropolis.' It is centuries before we hear anything of the scattered settlers who dwelt here and there along the highways through the great Middlesex forest: and it is not until the foundation or restoration of Westminster by the Confessor, that we know of a single abbey, or of a single considerable town, within its very indefinite boundaries. We do not know when Hertfordshire was divided from it on the north, and though the Colne and the Brent give us its western outline, the valley of the Lea on the east—the battlefield of the Londoners in many a hard-fought struggle with the Danish invader—was still

untenanted. Eadward addresses himself on behalf of 'the holy men of St. Peter' and their broad lands to the first sheriff of Middlesex, whose name could be recovered even by the industry of Kemble. While Leofwine was earl of what we should call the Home Counties, as Mr. Freeman remarks, Ælfget was Sheriff of Middlesex, and the king names him in a charter relating to the manor of Shepperton, which Ulf, or Wulf, had given to the Abbey. Ulf himself is described as sheriff in another charter, and the mention of his name brings us at once to the point we seek; for Ulf the Sheriff of Middlesex is identical with Ulf the Portreeve of London, and we can thus form a definite opinion as to the influence of the city upon the county, while as yet their official connexion was only that of neighbourhood. The citizens had manors in all the region round about; and may be traced through the pages of the Domesday Survey in Surrey and Kent, in Herts and Essex, as well as in Middlesex. Ulf owned Hanworth and Hillingdon, and is described as a 'huscarl' or a 'thegn' of King Eadward's. The name of Ulf is a common one just before the Conquest, and it is probably owing to the number of Ulfs who were more important, possibly to the number who were less important than himself, that Ulf the Portreeve is seldom included in the London lists, and that the modern seeker fails to find him where he is most reasonably expected to figure. The king alone usurps the credit of the munificent gift with which Ulf and his wife Kinegif endowed the royal foundation; and among the newly calendared evidences at St. Paul's he does not seem to be mentioned even as an alderman, like Leofstan or Alsi or Esegar or Wolfgar,

all of them also portreeves in the reign of the last king of the ancient line.

Of Esegar, Esgar, or Ansgar, the hero of Hastings, the peacemaker of Berkhampstead, I have already given a few particulars. That he was Sheriff of Middlesex for a time there can be no doubt, though his office of 'Staller' seems to have overshadowed his sheriffdom: and that, like Ulf, he was a large landowner is plain from the numerous entries in the Survey, even after we have allowed for the existence of other individuals who bore the same name. His manors in Middlesex were Northolt (Northall), Edmonton, and Enfield, all of which were given to Geoffrey Mandeville. Neither Ulf nor Esegar continued to retain a manor as late as 1086, nor can we find their sons in the Middlesex returns; and other citizens fared equally ill at the hands of the conqueror.

To judge even approximately of the influence left to the Londoners in Middlesex at the accession of Henry I., it would be needful to go very carefully through the names in Domesday not only of those citizens who had manors or lands of any kind, but also of those who had tenants, or villains, in the county. The word 'villain' hardly translates the English 'ceorl,' and appears first in England after the Conquest; but, whatever its exact meaning, philologically or legally, we may safely take it here, especially when it is applied to the 'men' of a non-resident lord, to signify that certain cultivators were the servants or bondsmen of a citizen who, whether from his having bought them and their land, or possibly from his having bound them by the loan of money, had become responsible for them as his vassals. The law of commen-

dation was apparently harsh, but really mild, and conduced to the benefit of the tenant; but this and other points of the kind need not be enlarged upon here. I only mention them with the object of showing that until we can identify all the names of Londoners who had tenants of this kind in Middlesex, we cannot fully appraise the interests of the citizens in the county, and the power, whether of money or of political importance, which gave them that influence.

Although such an identification would be impossible in the present state of our knowledge, we are not wholly in the dark as to several of these city and county magnates. I must pass by such tempting names as that of Ulf the son of Mann, who had a vassal at Ickenham; that of Wluardus his neighbour, who had two; and that of Azor, who had many in different manors: because it would be impossible to treat of them at large without entering on many doubtful questions. For similar reasons I must pass by the two brothers of whom we read that in the reign of King Edward they had held the manor of Charlton, and that one was the man of Earl Leofwine, and the other of Archbishop Stigand. But there are two or three which cannot be passed by. For example, under Hatton, there is mention of Albert the Lotharingian, who has left us his name in a modern city street. He must have been among the fellow-countrymen of Hermann, Adelhard, Leofric, and others from Lotharingia, who in Eadward's reign attained high preferment. Albert is named once only in the Middlesex Survey; he had two sokemen in Hatton, who held between them a hide and a half of land in the days of King Edward, which they

could sell or give away as they pleased, so runs the entry; but, it adds, 'homines Alberti Lothariensis erant.' The Survey, however, tells us much more about him under Bedfordshire; he had two manors in that county, which he held from the king, and there were other outlying lands; but of Celgrave, the first mentioned, we learn that he had owned it 'in the time of King Edward,' and continued to own it at the time of the Survey. When we add to these possessions his house near St. Margaret's Church in London, and the probability that, with all these possessions he also held a prebendal stall in the church, he must have been wealthy. When the list of the lands of St. Paul's in the city was made, some time before 1115, Albert the Lotharingian was probably dead; and though Lothbury continued, and continues to bear his name in an abbreviated form, it was occupied by another canon, and may have been attached as a residence to a prebend.

Another Londoner who had possessions without the walls was 'Aluuinus filius Britmar,' who is described in the Survey as a tenant on the Stepney manor of the Bishop. He, too, had lived through the perilous times of the Norman conquest, and still kept the mill which had been worth twenty shillings 'in the time of King Edward.' The name of Alwin catches the eye in any list of citizens, for though later writers spell it indifferently Eylwin, Ailwin, and even Alwynne, it was the same as Ægelwine, the name of the father of Henry, the first mayor. But 'Ægelwine Brihtmere's sune' is not 'Ægelwine Leofstan's sune,' and the difference is clearly marked in one of the oldest documents in

the archives of St. Paul's. This is a little parchment agreement in which a certain Bruchtric promises, on behalf of himself and his wife, to leave their lands to the church 'after their several days' in return for a share of the canon's diet of meat and ale—a provision, in short, for their declining years, and often made as a 'corrody'—a fruitful cause of dispute in later times. Among the witnesses we read the names of 'Ægelwine Brihtmere's sune,' of Leofstan, of Hearding, and of Bruning. The agreement is in Old English, or Saxon, and must be very nearly contemporary with the Domesday Book itself, when the grandfather of the first mayor was still young.

It would be but too easy to fill pages with similar names, but so far, it is not possible to link them together with certainty, or to identify many of the Alwins and Algars and Ulfs who figure in different parts of the return. Although no Leofstan, no Ælfgaet, no Swetman figures among the tenants, great or small, in Middlesex, London capitalists may have been better represented than is now apparent. Of one Algar, the owner of half a hide in Islington, I must say something, though he is only returned as having held it in the time of King Edward; for, if 'Derman of London,' the only English tenant in chief, was his son, as there seems reason to believe, we have a rare example of hereditary succession.

'Derman of London' is recorded to have held, directly of King William, half a hide of land worth ten shillings, in Islington. As in the case of Ulf, there are many men of the same name, and did this entry stand alone it would be almost impossible to say

which of them was the Deorman or 'Derman' of the Middlesex Domesday. The name occurs again in Hertfordshire, where 'Derman' is described as a thegn of King William. At Oxford 'Dereman' has a house, and 'Derman,' in conjunction with Brictric, another. But besides these entries in the Domesday Book, the name also occurs in other records of the Norman period. Mr. Parker ('Early History of Oxford') has noticed it several times; and Mr. Lyte ('Calendar of MSS. at St. Paul's') gives us four very early entries in which a Dereman is mentioned. 'Deormannus monetarius' witnesses an undated deed of the very beginning of the twelfth century, at the latest. In 1122, Edwin, and some forty years later William, the sons of 'Derman,' sign documents. There is also a certain 'Deormannus presbiter, filius Leofredi presbiteri,' who seems to have been living in 1100, and very probably was a contemporary of King William, if not of King Edward, and there was a member of the cnightengild named Orgar the son of Deremen.

That Deorman or Dereman or Derman of London was any one of these it would be rash to assert. But the 'monetarius' of the document at St. Paul's may well be the proprietor of the half hide in Islington which Algar had held T. R. E., and there is no reason that he may not have been the thegn who had a few acres in Watton, though the identification has been refused by Mr. Tomlin ('Perambulation of Islington,' p. 36). Deorman's name would not be worth dwelling on so long if these were all the contemporary evidences we could find; but there is a little strip of parchment at the Guildhall which relates to a 'Deormanne,' and

which has for centuries, I may say, been an object of interest to historians and antiquaries. There is not, so far as I can remember, a single English document, so short and so plain, which has given rise to so many misreadings and mistaken explanations. An Egyptian demotic contract could not have admitted of such various interpretations. The parchment resembles very closely in size and writing the little charter of William to the bishop and the portreeve, and there is much reason to suppose that the two are of the same age. It is a writ to 'Willelm bisceop,' and 'Swegn scyr-gerefan,' and all the king's thanes in Essex, and acknowledges or confirms the claim of Deorman, who is called by the king 'minan men,' my man, to a hide of land, at 'Gyddesdune.'

Where is Gyddesdune? Had this writ admitted of doubt, or had the Domesday Survey ever been found untrustworthy, had the custodians of civic records been in the habit of forging title-deeds like some of their monastic neighbours, we might have seen a choice open as to the comparative veracity of the two documents. There is a Gaddesdon, or Gadesden in Hertfordshire, but there is none, at least there is none now, in Essex. Yet Domesday gives us particulars of a hide of land in Chafford Hundred which bore the name of 'Geddesdune' and belonged to the abbey of Westminster. The difficulty is thus twofold, for first we have to find a Geddesdune in Chafford, and next we have to account for its belonging not to Deorman, who is not even mentioned, but to the abbey of Westminster. Many things may happen in ten or eleven years: the writ must be dated before 1075, when Bishop William died, and the Survey

was not made till 1086: the king himself gave the Chafford lands to the abbey, and he may have arranged the matter with Deorman. But it is curious to observe that Deorman is not mentioned as ever having received possession under William's peremptory writ. The half hide in Islington which, as I have said, had been Algar's in the time of Edward the Confessor, was Deorman's now, and it has generally been assumed that Deorman was Algar's son. Of this there is so far no positive evidence: but Deorman had a son named Algar, and this second Algar is the first recorded prebendary of Islington, where on their manor of Highbury the descendants of 'Bertram of Barrow,' son of Terric, son of Deorman, flourished for several generations, ending in an heiress in 1271. I need not apologise for the length of these notes on Deorman of London. They might be greatly enlarged: but my purpose is to show, on the one hand, what a profitable field of investigation is habitually neglected by London historians, and on the other, how extensive the influence of a citizen may have been, even though he had but half a hide of land in Middlesex. I may repeat, that an adequate account of Middlesex at the time of the Domesday Survey is still unwritten. There is no county in England which can be compared with it in wealth, population and importance; yet there is no county about which its inhabitants have so little power of gaining accurate knowledge and about which so many historical questions remain unanswered. For example, Mr. Elton and others have remarked upon the frequency in the neighbourhood of London of curious modifications of the law of gavelkind, but no London historian has accounted for them, and many writers have

absurdly derived the name of Kentish Town from the supposed prevalence on that prebendal manor, properly Cantelupe's, or Cantlow's, of a Kentish form of the custom.

To understand the history of London, that of the surrounding country must also be understood; but to set forth at full length as Lyons did in his day the history of all the manors in all the counties which are now reckoned as part of our modern London would be impossible here, and I can only mention those which bear directly on the city history, and of them only a few typical examples in Middlesex itself.

The suburbs, as I have said, owe their present condition not so much to the city as to the Church. By the time Henry I. made his grant of the county to the city the broad lands of Middlesex had, almost wholly, passed into the possession of the great ecclesiastical foundations. What St. Paul's had left, St. Peter's acquired; and St. Martin's, St. Bartholomew's, and a little later, Holy Trinity at Aldgate, were watching to pick up the fragments that the others had overlooked. So that we must ascribe the modern suburbs, with their curious anomalies of local government, the so-called 'metropolitan area' with its imaginary boundaries, its districts and precincts, its boards and its vestries, answering to the sokes and liberties, the sanctuaries and wards within the walls, more to the clergy than to the municipality. The city supplied the population to colonise the wastes and woods; but the Church supplied the houses for them to dwell in, marked out their streets, controlled the direction of each fresh stream of emigrants. When the first settlers along Holborn, or in

Norton, or by the White Chapel, went forth from the city gates, it might have been expected that the rulers who had sway within the walls, and to whom Middlesex now belonged, as much as it had belonged to Earl Leofwine in the good days of King Edward, would have guided their steps and continued to govern their actions. But where the citizens formed 'wards without' the walls it was only by the leave, or in spite of the prohibition, of the Church. The king when he gave to London the jurisdiction he had exercised in Middlesex could give no land with it. At the time of the Survey the royal estates had passed already to the Church, and William hardly owned an acre in the county. The estates of the Norman nobles had nearly all gone into the same hands by the time of Henry's accession; and an enumeration of the Middlesex manors which never, at any time, were held 'in mortmain,' would not comprise half-a-dozen names. The citizens could not protect their public meeting-place, their parade-ground, their markets within the walls, from the grasp of the 'dead hand;' much less could they protect the new colonies of citizens in Kensington or Chelsea, in Hackney or Tyburn, far out in the open country.

The first in age, wealth, and power of these ecclesiastical corporations was the capitular body, the bishop and canons of the diocese of London, whose cathedral church was the minster of St. Paul. According to the medieval tradition, the manors which belonged to it were either the gift of kings whose names were thereby commemorated, or had been Church property since ever property in land existed. Of some few of

these estates it is possible to learn more definite particulars. When the East and Middle Saxons began to call the northern shores of the Thames after themselves, and to recognise the differences of race or geographical situation which are preserved for us in the names of Essex and Middlesex, the bishop, whose 'bishop-stool' was in London, ruled over the church of both, and made the walled city, as Bæda tells us, the 'metropolis' of his see. The East Saxons were more numerous than the Middle Saxons, and their country was wider and richer. We do not know whether the kings of Essex conquered the kings of Middlesex—we do not know that there were any kings of Middlesex, but the first time we meet with the name it is in a grant by Suæbred, King of Essex, to the Bishop of London of lands at Twickenham, 'in provincia quæ nuncupatur Middelseaxan.' This was dated June 13, 704; and shows that already, four centuries before the City obtained the county 'in ferm,' the Church had begun to obtain possession of the land.

The history of the Church in London and round London is thus complicated: for we must divide the political from the ecclesiastical, and trace the religious or parochial influence wholly apart from the topographical or manorial. Kenred of Mercia followed the example of Suæbred of Essex; Æthelstan and Eadgar and Æthelred were as lavish with the manors which surrounded the city walls, and if Cnut and Eadward and William gave less, it was only because there was less left to be given. The significance of these grants consists in their influence on the growth of suburbs, an influence still powerful. At intervals of only a few months we meet,

again and again, chiefly in the reports of lawsuits, with statements of cases which arise out of the old Church laws. These reports are constantly concerned with London history, and turn on the wording of some ecclesiastical charter. Lincoln's Inn itself was the subject of such a controversy not many years ago, and the boundaries of St. Margaret's and St. Martin's turn on the interpretation put in 1833 on the will by which Hubert de Burgh left Whitehall to the Friars Preachers in 1293. The tithes of what was once the estate of the priory at Aldgate were lately in question, and the result was governed by settlements made long before the dissolution. A lease lately fell in which had been granted by Robert Baldock, a canon of St. Paul's, in 1315. The parish of Holy Trinity claimed, and, it seems, was allowed, to be outside the city boundary on the ground that it represented the old priory of Aldgate. This was an error, but it shows how long these influences lasted. The sanctuary at St. Martin's, the exempt precincts of the Black and the White Friars, and many similar examples, will occur to the reader.

The estates of the Bishop of London, and of the canons of St. Paul's, were the most extensive in Middlesex at the time of the Survey, and did not increase materially afterwards. Besides the bishop's manors of Stepney, Hornsey, and Fulham, the thirty stalls of the canons had each its attached prebendal manor, and twenty-three of these manors were in Middlesex. At what period they were acquired it is now impossible to tell. The charters of early kings granting them are of doubtful authenticity: but at the time of the Conquest

the canons were already in possession. They had no cure of souls in their manors, which differed only from those held by laymen in that they could not sell them. They lived in their manor-houses, in many cases with their wives and children, surrounded by their tenants and their serfs. The canons of St. Paul's before the thirteenth century, if not later, were in most respects like the other lords of manors among whom they dwelt. As a rule they were only in deacon's orders, and seldom attended at their cathedral, unless some question as to the division of the revenues arose, or the election of a bishop or a dean was to be held. They often arranged to leave their prebendal manors to their sons, and in other cases the relatives of canons were provided for as farmers of those manors whose rent belonged to the common fund. It is to the credit of the canons, both here and in other churches of the old foundation, that they set a good example by the manumission of their slaves: but many of them had, until a very late period, tenants whose position was little removed from slavery. The 'hidarii,' the 'nativi,' the 'ackermanni' of a prebendal manor could not leave it without the permission of their lord; and beside these there were other bondsmen still lower in the scale. Many examples of the sale of slaves from the prebendal manors in Essex might be adduced; but they are rarer in Middlesex. Yet it is recorded that at the end of the thirteenth century the bishop gave to Ralph de Diceto, the great dean of St. Paul's, a slave named John, who was a carpenter, the son of the bishop's carpenter at Fulham, no doubt for the work then going on in the cathedral. About the same time, perhaps for

the same work, perhaps for manumission, Walter de Windsor gave 'to God, to St. Mary, and to St. Paul,' Godwin, the carpenter, together with Ranulph and Richard, his brothers, and all their belongings.

The prebendal manors of St. Paul in the immediate neighbourhood of London comprised all that we know as Finsbury, Shoreditch, Moorfields, Hoxton, and Islington on the north, and stretched westward along the great highway, through Holborn, St. Pancras, and Rugmere, to Willesdon, further north-west. Beyond all these was Chiswick, the westernmost of the prebendal possessions. Some of these great manors were divided in the twelfth century, and separate holdings were assigned to certain canons. Thus, the manor of Willesdon, which comprised the whole parish of that name, and was from time immemorial appointed for the provision of daily bread and beer in the cathedral establishment, was broken up at a meeting of the chapter in 1150, and small farms or estates were appropriated to the unendowed stalls. The names of these new manors are interesting as in most cases telling us who was the incumbent of the stall when the division was made, and, among them, 'Mapesbury' commemorates to this day, on the gatepost of a suburban villa, the residence of the witty archdeacon on whom for centuries every priestly jest and every Latin rhyme was fastened. Seven centuries later, another prebendal jester sat in the stall appropriated to Neasdon, a division of the same great manor, but it may be that Sydney Smith knew nothing of Walter Map. Similar divisions had been made on some of the Essex estates, and in St. Pancras, and the land due north of the city walls,

Moorfields, 'Eald Street,' Holywell, and Hoxton. This last-named stall was held successively by Osbern and Gaufridus his son, and by Hugh, called the archdeacon, and his son Henry. Many similar examples of hereditary succession in prebendal estates might be quoted, and in other Cathedral churches of the old foundation, as at Wells, the prebendal estates were similarly divided: but the addition of the canon's name as in Brownswood, Brondesbury, Reculverland and others, seems to be almost if not quite peculiar to London.

Next to the bishop and his canons were the abbot and monks of Westminster, whose estates in Middlesex were, however, neither so extensive nor so ancient as ecclesiastical endowments. Of them all, the most important in its influence on the growth of suburban London, was the great manor of St. Peter, which formed after the time of the Confessor the parish of St. Margaret. It extended eastward from Millbank to the Fleet, and northward from the Thames to the ancient highway which we know as Oxford Street. Notwithstanding the size of this immense holding, which comprises now the site of the largest and most populous city in the world, its value must have been but small, and until the twelfth century at least, the greater part of it lay empty and open. At that time the bishop's estate at Stepney and the canons' estate in Shoreditch were already being rapidly colonised, and but little of the modern Westminster had permanently emerged from the Thames. The date of the foundation of the abbey is involved in doubt, as is that of the grant of the land adjoining it. A very early but, it is nearly certain, a forged document is quoted by all the authorities as

defining the boundaries in 951, under Eadgar. But the difficulties in the way of its acceptance as contemporary evidence are insuperable; and, so far, I have not found any unquestionable evidence that Westminster Abbey was in existence before the Danish conquest. The comparative unimportance of its estate, the boundaries of which were certainly doubtful as late as 1222; the remoteness of its other Middlesex manors, and the evident difficulties which Edward the Confessor encountered in obtaining for it an adequate endowment, as may be seen in the number and tone of the charters, genuine or fictitious, which were produced by the abbey at the time of the refoundation by Henry III., as well as the protracted, but historically instructive, controversies with the neighbouring city of London to which they led, are almost sufficient in themselves to prove that St. Paul's is far older as an endowed foundation; and this view is partially confirmed by the name of the West Minster, which goes to show that, before the abbey was generally known among the people, another minster was in existence to the eastward. The early history of the royal abbey has still to be unravelled. The absence of any local name, unless that of Thorney be accepted, the existence of a king's house, the recent discovery of Roman remains in the church—these, and many other points, which seem to be incompatible with any of the received theories, must be cleared up before we know as much about the origin and growth of Westminster as we do even about the origin and growth of St. Paul's.

Closely adjoining to the prebendal Rugmere (now St. Giles's and Bloomsbury) lay the eastern half of the

parish of St. John, divided by the Tyburn from Lilleston, the western part, which again touched the abbey lands of Paddington. The two manors by the brook have been known together as the parish of St. Marylebone (St. Mary 'le Bourne') since the older church of St. John was removed in 1400 on account of the remoteness of its situation. One of them, called in the Domesday Book 'Teoburne,' 'always lay and lies,' we are told, 'in the church of Barking;' that is, it had belonged from time immemorial to the abbey which good Bishop Erkenwald had founded. The western manor is commemorated in Lisson, properly Lilleston, Grove, and other local names, and did not fall to the Church till after the Conquest; but as early as 1338 it belonged to the knights of St. John. In Domesday it is enumerated as among the lands 'given in alms,' *in elemosina data*, and was held by the lady Eddeva (Eadgifu), having before the Conquest belonged to Edward the son of Suain. Westbourne and Paddington were sometimes considered part of the great parish of St. Margaret, Westminster, and were also claimed by the church of St. Paul. Chelsea, too, at the southern side, which in the Domesday Book is assigned to Edward de Sarisberie, had been in dispute before the abbey obtained a lease of it in 1368; while Kensington, which at the time of the Survey belonged to Aubrey de Vere, fell, in great part at least, into the hands of the Abbot of Abingdon early in the twelfth century. There is a charter of Eadward to Bishop Robert, Osgood Clapa, and Ulf the sheriff, which relates, as is believed, to Chelsea, under the name of 'Cealchylle,' with its wood situated near Kingsbury. This wood, no doubt, is the outlying district of Kensal Green and

Kensal Town, which was brought into prominence at some recent parliamentary elections. The manor of Chelsea was, however, less in clerical hands than in lay before the suppression, and its history, complicated with that of Westminster, though very interesting, cannot be detailed here.

The object of a survey of the ecclesiastical holdings in the neighbourhood of London and county of Middlesex is, of course, apparent when we ask why the city, as its suburbs spread into the adjacent and subject district, was unable to extend the civic system of government. The effort was made with some success at first; but eventually it failed, and its failure, which may be dated as far back as the end of the thirteenth century, or we may say to the period of the wardenship of Sir Ralph Sandwich, has of late years been discussed as part of a political problem. London and its suburbs under one central government of mayor and aldermen, with a lower house of common council, and a population equal in numbers to that of Holland, nearly to that of Ireland, and equal in wealth, culture and intelligence to all the rest of the kingdom put together, is a vision so fascinating to some minds that it seems almost to upset their balance. That, so far, London has not realised the vision, may be accounted for historically; and, as I have endeavoured to show, the chief difficulty which impeded the extension of the civic frontier was the opposition of the lords of the adjacent manors, all of them represented before the end of the thirteenth century by the 'dead hand,' the continuous policy, the unwavering constancy of purpose which characterise the ecclesiastical bodies on whom, as on trustees, so many landed estates had

devolved. It is easy to see that the idea of resisting the growth of the city and its jurisdiction did not at first occur to the canons or the abbots who were lords of the manors. The great extensions northward, Bishopsgate Without, Cripplegate Without, and Aldersgate, were effected noiselessly. It was manifestly for the benefit of the estates that they should be kept in order by the city machinery: and probably the annexation of the great suburb along Fleet Street westward would have been completed without further trouble, only for the interference of Henry III., and his refoundation of the abbey of Westminster. Henry hated the citizens, and without any settled policy, lost no opportunity of humiliating them. Sometimes he took the part of the people against their rulers, sometimes he called in the rulers to help him against the people. The rights claimed by the Abbot of Westminster over his manors in outlying counties were allowed by the king: but the king had no sheriff in Middlesex, and the citizens refused to recognise the exemption of the rapidly growing town round the abbey. The citizens' Sheriff of Middlesex had power to enter all the vills and tenements in the county even to the gate of the abbey. So they asserted and so a jury found in 1263: but the controversy had raged bitterly for nearly half a century; and a compromise by which the boundaries of the abbot's manor had been fixed in 1222 proved to be only the beginning of the strife. The city extended itself to Temple Bar along the new suburb without Ludgate, and placed the district under the alderman who already ruled Holborn. The advowson of the churches, St. Bride's and St. Dunstan's, remained with the abbey, but the limits of the manor

of St. Peter, the parish of St. Margaret, no longer reached to 'Lundene Fenn,' as the Fleet was called in the charter ascribed to King Eadgar. The date at which the old postern at Ludgate became available for ordinary traffic has not been ascertained: but there is mention as early as 1285 of a street leading to the Fleet river. It was not until 1393 that the ward of Farringdon Without was formally recognised in an Act of Parliament.

The extension of another city ward, Coleman Street, in a northerly direction was effected in 1315, when, as I have already mentioned, the mayor and commons took a lease from Robert Baldock of his prebendal manor of Finsbury, or Holywell, sometimes described as 'Mora de Haliwell,' at the rental of 1*l.* a year. The lease was renewed from time to time till 1867, when the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, into whose hands the prebendal estates had fallen, assumed possession; but the civic rights of the inhabitants of this portion of the ward were not called in question, and the prebendal manor of Holywell remains in the city ward of Coleman Street.

The jurisdiction of the sheriffs of London in Middlesex has, like the sheriffs' jurisdiction elsewhere in England, been considerably modified by various legal enactments, which do not concern the historian. But the grant of Henry I. is still in force, and the sheriffs for city and county are still elected by the citizens. The offices are still distinct; there are undersheriffs for Middlesex, but not for London, where the sheriffs' deputies are the 'secondaries.' It would be easy to explain the difference on historical grounds; but I have still to describe the result of the last attempt to extend the city jurisdiction.

In the year 1327, as I mentioned in the last chapter, the manor of Southwark was conveyed to the citizens, in fee farm at 10*l.* a year, the object clearly being to obtain the same powers for the city sheriffs as they already enjoyed in Middlesex. The escape of malefactors across the bridge into Surrey, where the civil officers of justice had no jurisdiction, was specially stated as a reason for the grant, and clearly shows its intention. But the grant was incomplete. The area of the king's manor was very small—it is still known as the 'Guildable Manor.' In 1462 further powers were obtained; but again, as the jurisdiction of the Sheriff of Surrey and other local officials was left untouched, and as the suburb was rapidly growing, the charter became practically inoperative. At length, when Henry VIII. had annexed the manor of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and when, a little later, the estate of the Abbot of Bermondsey also fell to the Crown, the city again tried to have its rights defined and extended; but it was not till 1550 that, after heavy payments, they obtained the enlargement of their manorial rights over the 'king's manor,' that is the former estate of the archbishop, and over the 'Great Liberty Manor,' as well as over the original king's manor, then described as the 'village of Southwark.' The charter conveying these and some other smaller holdings expressly states its object that Southwark should become to all intents and purposes a part of London. The difference between the eleventh century and the sixteenth century in such things as manors and wards and aldermanries is well illustrated by what followed. The inhabitants were desired to select four citizens

from among whom the Court of Aldermen might choose the first alderman of Southwark. Sir John Ayliff, 'barber surgeon,' who had been a sheriff of London two years earlier, was chosen; and the title of 'Bridge Without' was conferred upon the new ward. Common councilmen were named if not formally elected, and all, we may suppose, went well at first; but, whether from the unhappy state of the kingdom at the time, and the difficulties which would have attended any revision of the former grants in the face of the possible restoration of the religious houses by Queen Mary, or whether because the aldermen and common council were not sure of their ground, and because the Sheriff of Surrey still claimed and exercised his old powers in the new ward: the common council declared, in 1557, that the inhabitants had neglected their duty of choosing four citizens, and that, as the custom had fallen into disuse, in future the alderman of Bridge Without was to be chosen by the Mayor and Court of Aldermen. Thus, apparently after a brief existence of seven years as the equal of any other city ward, Southwark became a mere poor dependent: and strange to say, three centuries have elapsed without any revival of its privileges. The oldest of the city aldermen sits for Bridge Without, but his honorary office is the reward of long service. Spasmodic efforts have occasionally been made to remedy the anomaly; but to this day Southwark, as part of the city of London, has none of the rights of any other ward, and, at least until a recent period, was reckoned for many purposes as still in Surrey. I have tried to summarise a curious story, as set forth with many complications, in the evidence

before parliamentary committees; politically, I suppose the matter cannot be of much importance, and Bridge Without is probably as well governed as any other ward; historically, there is much interest in tracing the causes which, if I am right in identifying Southwark with Ptolemy's London in Cantium, have exalted the daughter at the mother's expense, and have left the ancient city to be alternately, according to which view we take of it, a village in Surrey, or a district, subject like Middlesex to the newer London on the other bank of the Thames.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH IN LONDON.

St. Paul's—Bishop Erkenwald – British Church—The Diocese—The Canons—Parishes—Church-building in the Twelfth Century—Dedications—Early Parochial Divisions—View of London before the Reformation—The Religious Houses—Chantries—Wren's Churches.

In the last chapter an endeavour to describe the influence of the city on Middlesex seemed to resolve itself into an account of the influence of the Church on both. But the Church within the walls requires a longer notice, and would well repay a more detailed examination than it can receive here. In the early development of England, the Church had as much hand as the State; if indeed we can separate Church and State while as yet their interests were mainly identical. The well-being of the people, the prosperity and protection of commerce, the regulation of social life and the settlement of differences, were the aims of the Church as much as of the laity. No reader of Bæda can fail to recognise a quality, a tone, or a cast of thought which is wholly absent from the religious chronicles of a later age. The history of the Church in London presents the same features. At first the foundation of St. Paul's and the establishment of the ecclesiastical system were

an unmitigated blessing. The career of St. Erkenwald, so far as we know it, was an uninterrupted course of good, useful, and far-sighted measures for the benefit of the poor, for the provision of Christian teaching, and for the stability of the fabric of the Church.

The persistent traditions of the medieval clergy as to a Roman or British Church in London, and the lists, which Bishop Stubbs moderately characterises as 'uncritical,' of pre-Saxon bishops in the church of St. Peter on Cornhill, may yet contain some faint traces of real history. But while it is impossible to turn from these apocrypha with indifference, it is equally impossible to use them as history in the present state of our knowledge. I have already shown that London was not a walled city in 314 when Restitutus attended the Council of Arles. Restitutus is, in fact, more real than London.

But the names of St. Alban, St. Helen, and others, which at first sight appear of the highest antiquity among the city dedications, are soon seen to belong not so much to a survival of British tradition as to a revival of Roman influence, and are no more to be relied upon as a sign of antiquity than the name of King Lucius on a tablet of the thirteenth century, or the name of King Belin in Billingsgate. The authentic and continuous history of municipal London begins with the reign of Alfred; the ecclesiastical history reaches further back; but there is little to be learned in the long tale of alternate conversion and apostacy, before the saintly Erkenwald was summoned from his abbey at Chertsey, to become Bishop of London. His episcopate of eighteen years sufficed in the opinion of

his successors for a series of improvements and reforms, religious and civic, which entitled him to the everlasting gratitude of the Londoners. He is reported to have encouraged them to rebuild their walls, himself setting the example by restoring the exit upon the northern road, ever since called after him, the Bishop's Gate. To him is attributed also the erection of many churches, and his tomb in St. Paul's was for centuries pointed out beside that of King Sebbi, of Essex, through whose help he had been able to do so much for the city. But, in truth, the diocesan history of London has yet to be written, contemporary evidence, of which a small amount undoubtedly exists, has to be sifted, and, above all, a scientific examination of documents until lately unknown, must be made before we can feel sure how much of the ecclesiastical London, as we have it, is owed to Erkenwald, how much to the restoration under Alfred, and how much to the ignorant reverence of the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Modern London has endeavoured with some success to obliterate the memorials of the early episcopate. The home of the bishops was in London; now it is in Westminster; and the distant manor-house of Fulham is called a palace. The bishop's manor of Stepney is the great sad 'east end,' where he does not own an acre; and its hamlets are called after the Tower, which only touches one corner of the parish. Essex, whose king was his immediate patron, is torn from the see, and another bishop-stool is set up in the church of Offa's great foundation in Hertfordshire, the indefinite northern territory of the Middle Saxons. The bishop himself is but an occasional visitor to the chief city of

his diocese, and has no residence within its boundaries. I shall have to leave the diocesan history of which these great changes form so strange a feature to be detailed elsewhere; but it would, I venture to think, be wrong that any writer who touches on the relations of London and its bishop should omit to note with regret, and something more than regret, that it is to the zeal of the last three successors of Erkenwald, one of them the only London bishop who bore the same name, that we owe the destruction of some of the loveliest churches that any city ever boasted, for reasons so secret or so inadequate that they escape the most diligent inquiry.

There has been already a good deal said in this book about the canons of St. Paul's and their prebends. The church, whose fabric, till the other day, was the newest in England, was a cathedral of the old foundation. Like Wells and Chichester, Salisbury and Exeter, it always had secular canons, not monks, in its chapter. I do not like to say that St. Paul's is not still an old foundation church; but as there are now four residentiary canons—the residentiaries used to be called 'stagiaries'—who, by the way, have no prebendal manors or stalls—and as the revenues of the thirty canons go to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and are not applied even to save a city church from destruction; and as, moreover, the stagiaries are appointed chiefly in order that they may preach within the church, the differences between St. Paul's as it is now and as it was five centuries ago are so great that a regard for truth forbids us to reckon it still a cathedral 'of the old foundation.' For some time too, I do not know how long, the canons of St. Paul's have been denominated 'prebendaries,' and the title they bore in

the Domesday Book is applied only to the preachers who have, in fact, no separate estates assigned to them. The anomalies thus made legal are too many and too complicated for detail here. The old preaching place, St. Paul's Cross, has disappeared; there is only one chapel; the old canons have their stalls, and each stall has the name of its prebendal manor upon it, but only the new canons have incomes from the estates; and a 'prebendary of St. Paul's' is almost in the position of an 'honorary canon.'

All through the eleventh and twelfth centuries the canons of St. Paul's fulfilled their duties as country squires, and it is difficult to resist the idea that, after the depopulation of Essex and Middlesex by the long Danish wars, the canon was expected to live on his manor as a kind of colonist, a missionary of civilisation, if not of religion. The position of some of the Irish clergy may have been analogous. The canon does not seem to have taken any necessary part in the services of the church of his manor: but otherwise, like the Connaught rector before 1869, he was the wealthiest and most cultured person in the parish, the local magistrate, the adviser and helper of his people. To the canons was owed the gradual enfranchisement of the slaves in the diocese of London; and the same may be observed of the lords of the prebendal manors of Wells and Exeter and other places. But as time went on and the prebends of St. Paul's were held by statesmen and courtiers as the rewards of service or acknowledgments of favour, they became neither more nor less than honorary sources of income. One stage more was reached when the tenants of the

canons retained all the profits; and now it is difficult to identify the site of manors which existed at least as long as the old foundation itself. We are told that the Greys had the manor on which Gray's Inn now stands; but it always belonged to the canon who occupied the prebendal stall of Portpool. So, too, the prebendary of Rugmere was Lord of Bloomsbury and St. Giles's, and the prebendary of Cantelows of Kentish Town. The commissioners have sold the prebendal manors of Islington and Stoke Newington and others, I believe, but the names remain on the stalls in the church, and the sales are only worth noticing because they show that something worth selling was left.

The 'stagiaries' or resident canons conducted the services of the church, and it was, we may presume, the smallness of their number, in spite of the increase in their emoluments, that led to the foundation of a college of minor canons, eventually incorporated in 1394 by Richard II. It is curious to observe that the lodgings provided for these priests was not within the old precincts, which were, no doubt, by that time completely filled with the houses of the canons, the archdeacons, Master of the Scholars, now the Chancellor, and other functionaries, with the palace of the bishop and the residence of the dean. On the south of the cathedral nave, within the cloister, blocked up on one side by the transept and on the other by the parish church of St. Gregory, was the chapter-house. The bakehouse and the brewhouse can hardly have occupied the places now filled by the deanery and what used to be Doctors' Commons until the old parade-ground had been annexed by the chapter; but here, as in so many other

points, information fails us, not that ample records do not exist, but that no one has been at the pains of consulting them.

A still more obscure point—and one on which I fear no records will be found to help us—is as to the place occupied by St. Paul's as a centre of religious teaching. Was there ever a parish of St. Paul's? I do not doubt that at first, in, say, the days of Erkenwald, parochial duties were performed by the clergy of the episcopal church: but the traces left by this period are very slight. They consist of certain links of negative proof only. The great religious houses in the tenth and eleventh centuries found the presence of an ordinary parochial congregation very irksome. At St. Martin's they built the small church of St. Lawrence. At Westminster they provided St. Margaret's. At Holy Trinity, Aldgate, they provided St. Katharine 'Cree.' At St. Mary's, in Southwark, which was founded much later, and after two parish churches had been built, they reversed the process, and absorbed the smaller churches. At St. Paul's the bishop and his canons must either have provided St. Gregory's and St. Faith's to relieve the cathedral church, or found them on the spot already. This second view will hardly bear examination. St. Gregory's parish includes the ancient precinct, St. Faith's, which is much further north, that part of the precinct which was covered by the extension of the buildings in the fourteenth century. The parish assigned to St. Gregory must, I think, have been that part of the original parish of St. Paul, if there was a parish of St. Paul at any time, which was left to it when the smaller parochial divisions were made, perhaps

when King Alfred recolonised London, perhaps much later.

One thing is certain: when the records commence, soon after the Norman Conquest, we find a ring of small churches round St. Paul's; and we find that the dean and canons are the patrons of each benefice. The church of St. Paul is constantly alluded to as the mother church in agreements relating to the advowsons, but it may be only as the cathedral church of the diocese. Some of these small churches seem to have been actually built and endowed by the chapter; others, standing on their lands, were built by citizens who gave them to the canons on certain conditions. These conditions are sometimes very curious. When a man built and endowed a church he seems often, if not generally, to have become the first priest of it himself, and by arrangement with the canons he secured the incumbency to his son, or sons, for one or two lives. The church-builders are either wealthy citizens like Orgar the Proud, or married priests like Zachary, who have invested their savings in a church and desire to provide for their families. These men may be described as rectors. But when the chapter had obtained possession they never appointed rectors, and their nominees were always bound to pay a kind of rent for the living and not to give it up to any one except the dean and chapter. The system was carried so far that even a canon of the church, when he was appointed to hold a prebend in Middlesex or Essex, had to give an undertaking to the chapter that he would appoint no priest permanently to the parish church or churches in his gift as lord of the manor, but only temporary priests,

or, as we should say, stipendiary curates. This system was made illegal in the reign of Henry III.

The great fires of 1087 and 1137 seem to have stimulated the church-builders to greater activity, and a large number of the new churches may be recognised by their dedications. The cathedral was constantly growing from the time of the destruction of the old Saxon building. The long Norman nave was begun by Bishop Maurice in 1088, on so vast a scale that he had to bequeath its completion to his successors; and the building went on literally for centuries, the shingled spire, the tallest in Christendom, since it rose to the height of 520 feet, was not finished until 1315. The body of St. Erkenwald was translated with great solemnity on November 14, 1148. His tomb was always, even after the Reformation, the most sacred spot in the church, and his festival was the Great Day of all the year at St. Paul's; so much so, indeed, that as has lately been pointed out, the feast of the Conversion of St. Paul (January 25) is sometimes confounded with it, to the bewilderment of historians. The great length of the church when completed was a constant source of trouble between the chapter and the citizens; and there can be no question but that the ground on which the eastern end stood belonged to the citizens and was their old meeting-place. The dean and chapter, however, describing it as part of the king's highway, obtained pardon for their encroachments from Edward II., and when the houses in Old Change, the wall of the cathedral precinct, and the two gates, with a bell tower, stood between St. Paul's and the old market-place, there was little space left for the folk-

mote. The new market-place without the wall in Smithfield seems to have been used instead when the people assembled in their thousands after the beginning of the fourteenth century; and except that the bell remained in its old place till the reign of Henry VIII., and that congregations assembled round St. Paul's Cross to listen to sermons, as when Dr. Shaw recommended Richard III. to the people, the very spot was soon forgotten. The Watling Street, which from the earliest times had crossed the market-place towards Newgate, was stopped by the precinct and its wall, and partly diverted to avoid the east end of the church; and there was only a long roundabout way of access to Ludgate, too narrow and tortuous for vehicles. Great processions, such as those of kings from the Tower to Westminster, of course passed through the precinct and out at Ludgate, but the gates were not open for general traffic; and, no doubt, what could not go out westward by way of Newgate Street, turned southward to the Thames, the great highway of medieval London.

The parish churches are not mentioned by Bæda, and we have no proof that London was divided into more than three or four parishes until the time of King Alfred, or indeed, until much later. The little churches with their vicars have to some extent been accounted for above; and we must remember that the parochial boundaries were by no means so fixed in the tenth and eleventh centuries as they were after the thirteenth. Parochial assessments were unknown as yet. The bishop and his canons could assign a parish to a church as a modern rector assigns a district to a chapel of ease, with this difference, however, that six or seven

centuries ago the assignment was permanent. We find Henry I. asking the chapter to assign a parish to St. Mary Magdalen, Milk Street, of which one Geoffrey, a canon, is owner, and Bartholomew, his son, his successor; and there can be little doubt that St. Martin Orgar's and St. Botolph Billingsgate were built by Orgar the Proud; that St. John Zachary, St. Andrew Hubbard, St. Katharine Coleman, St. Benet Fink, St. Laurence Pountney, and other names commemorate founders, builders or restorers, chiefly of the early part of the twelfth century. In a few cases we have evidence of an earlier dedication being changed. St. Osyth's is now only remembered by 'Size Lane,' but the history of the church is indicated by the names connected with it. Early in the twelfth century we meet with Fulk 'de Sancta Osyda,' and about the same date, 1122, with 'Willelmus Serehog,' who dwelt close by. Here, then, we have mention of St. Osyth, and, almost in connection with it, of a man bearing the odd surname or nickname which Stow and Riley tried so hard to explain, and which clings to St. Benet Sherehog, the parish, now churchless, where St. Osyth's had stood. It has sometimes been supposed that as the Old English saints, Osyth and Ethelburga, both of whom were commemorated in London, were of the times immediately preceding those of Erkenwald, these churches were therefore dedicated by him; but it seems unlikely on careful investigation. St. Botolph is sometimes also looked upon as an early dedication. There were four churches, all at city gates, inscribed to the martyr of East Anglia, the patron, especially, of travellers to the northern Botolph's Town, or Boston.

These churches were at Aldersgate, at Bishopsgate, at Aldgate, and at Billingsgate. With regard to the first two I know nothing; but though the last two have always been reckoned on the same footing, the burden of proof of their antiquity is against it; for St. Botolph at Aldgate was built by Sired, a canon of St. Paul's, soon after the Conquest, and St. Botolph's at Billingsgate was built by Orgar, as we have seen.

From these and other indications, too long to be detailed here, I venture, as a working hypothesis, to suggest the probability that all these churches, including St. Helen's if not St. Alban's, and the churches dedicated to St. Benedict, generally shortened into St. Benet, do not date before the eleventh, perhaps not before the twelfth century. It would greatly simplify London parochial history if we could fix upon a few that are certainly old; but so far we only know of two or three. The cult of St. Benedict cannot have been common till long after the time of Erkenwald. Under Kentish, Mercian and West Saxon kings London may or may not have celebrated the virtues of a Northumbrian queen, or of an East Anglian martyr. St. Osyth may have been the mother of Offa of Essex, or another lady, 'virgin and martyr.' An Augustinian Priory in her honour was founded in Essex by Richard Belmeis, Bishop of London, before 1128. In either case it would be difficult to prove the early dedication of these churches. Though St. Erkenwald was venerated from the day of his death, his name was not used. For my present purpose it will be sufficient to have proved that some London churches were dedicated at a comparatively late period, and that we must not there-

fore argue as to the age by the name unless there should be corroborative evidence. St. Alphege, St. Magnus, St. Olave, St. Bride, St. Dunstan, and St. Sepulchre are names which go to prove that churches were newly built in old parishes and were dedicated at a period much later than that of Erkenwald, or even of Alfred. We know, for example, that St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, was built while Fleet Street was still part of St. Margaret's, Westminster, that is, before 1222, but after 988, when St. Dunstan died. It is quite easy to show that there is no antecedent improbability against the building of a number of new churches in each old parish in London, or against the assignment of a new parish—not a 'Peel' district, but a real parish—to each new church as late as the twelfth century.

We have another step to gain. In London it is observed that parishes of the same dedication are often near together. If we take first those in which they actually adjoin we have All Hallows the Great and All Hallows the Less; St. Mary Mounthaw and St. Mary Somerset, St. Nicholas Olave and St. Nicholas Cole Abbey; St. Katharine Cree and St. Katharine Coleman, and a few more. In each of these cases it is certain that a parish has been divided; in some of them the division is recorded. But if we endeavour to group these divisions so as to find out the name of the original parish, a very curious result is arrived at—one which seems, on the whole, to fit the case of every dedication, and it even helps us to a guess as to the date when London was divided into the numerous little parishes which still nominally subsist. When Alfred, or perhaps before him, the saintly bishop of the seventh century, or some

other organiser whose name may yet be found, colonised, or restored, or resettled, or refortified London, we may assume that there was no church, except perhaps St. Paul's, within the lines of the ruined Roman wall, and that the first organiser divided the city into parishes. But how many were they?

To answer this question a careful examination and sifting of the dedications will help us. If we begin with the west, excluding the later suburb beyond the Fleet, we find within Newgate, St. Martin's, St. Gregory's, St. Ewen's, St. Leonard, St. Michael le Querne, St. Vedast's, St. Faith's, St. Giles Cripplegate, St. Anne, St. John Zachary, St. Augustine, St. Benet and St. Peter Paul's Wharf, and a few more, all in the longitude of St. Paul's or to westward of it, and all but one or two of late dedication. In the case of a majority of these churches we know when and by whom they were founded. Here, then, we have enough to show that all round the 'mother church' of St. Paul a ring of smaller churches, most of them in the patronage of the chapter, were founded, some by the canons, some by private benevolence, some by a neighbouring religious house. The canons of St. Martin le Grand built St. Leonard and St. Vedast; the Grey Friars of Newgate Street built St. Ewen and St. Nicholas; Robert the son of Ralph the son of Herlewin built St. Michael le Querne; Alfune, the friend of Rahere, built St. Giles's, and Aelmund its priest, with his son Hugh, gave it to St. Paul's. These are only a few out of many which might be quoted; but I will assume that I have proved the substantial truth of my view, that while the western end of the city lay

unoccupied and empty, St. Paul's, or at most St. Paul's and St. Martin's, sufficed for its spiritual needs and ghostly comfort; but that as the old foundations withdrew from parochial duty, and the population waxed greater, churches were built and parishes assigned to them all over the great ancient division, which may have been a primitive parish of St. Paul's.

It is the same with the middle part of the city. Here, on both sides of the Wallbrook, we have a cluster of little parishes dedicated to St. Alban, St. Helen, St. Ethelburga, St. Botolph, St. Martin, St. Laurence, St. Benet, St. Osyth, St. Alphege, St. Olave, St. Magnus, St. Clement, St. Edmund, St. Mildred, St. Swithin, all probably late dedications, in the case of many of which, as further west, we know the exact date; and with them we have, still in the centre of the city, St. Mary 'Aldermary,' St. Mary 'le Bow,' St. Mary Abchurch, St. Mary Woolchurch, St. Mary Woolnoth, St. Mary Bothaw, St. Mary Colechurch, St. Mary Aldermanbury, and St. Mary Staining. This predominance of one dedication cannot be accidental. The curious term 'Aldermary' points at once to the mother church of the district, from which all the later dedications and all the St. Mary's must have been separated, leaving only a few, like St. Peter Cheap, or St. Thomas Apostle, unaccounted for.

We now come to the eastern third of the city. Here, having learned by experience, we look without delay for the dominant dedication, and find it at once in 'All Hallows.' There is first a great and ancient 'All Hallows, Barking,' with an outlying district north of the Tower; then comes All Hallows, Staining, which

may derive its name from a certain holding within the city, which is mentioned in Domesday, and apparently still earlier in a charter of the Confessor addressed to 'William, bishop; Harold, earl; and Esgar, staller,' as belonging to the manor of Staines. Besides these two, there are close to the same part of the city All Hallows on the Wall, a very extensive parish, and All Hallows, Lombard Street; and we know that St. Gabriel's was dedicated to St. Mary and All Saints. The chief churches not thus ascribed in the eastern part of the city are the two St. Katharines, St. Andrew, St. Dionis, St. Olave, and St. Dunstan. Of St. James's, Duke's Place, which only dates from the reign of James I., and St. Martin Outwich, of which also the history is well known, we need say nothing. The two St. Katharine's are probably connected with the hospital founded without the walls by Stephen's queen, and as they adjoin one another only count as one. It is difficult, therefore, to resist the conclusion that, as in the centre and western part of the city, a single dedication, this time, to All Saints, or All Hallows, included a tract from which, some time in the later, but still unchronicled, period before the middle of the twelfth century, the smaller parishes were separated, among them, unluckily for the legend of King Lucius, being St. Peter upon Cornhill, which seems to mark for us the site of the bishop's soke, already mentioned.

If the dedication to St. Katharine within the wall was connected with that to St. Katharine without the wall, it is still more curious to observe that the great parish of Stepney, the bishop's manor, as described in the Domesday Book, had also a church

dedicated to All Hallows. 'St. Dunstan's and All Saints' must have received its first and best known dedication not earlier than the beginning of the eleventh century, for the great archbishop only died in 988. The churches of St. Dunstan near the Tower, and of St. Dunstan in Fleet Street, near Temple Bar, must be of late foundation, and probably the first named was called after the patron of the east-end parish, who had once, as bishop of London, held it himself.

It would be easy to go further into the questions thus presented. The wall may not have been in such a state of repair as to form a distinct boundary, and Dunstan or his predecessor, Erkenwald, may have wholly overlooked its existence; but if we concede that the east end, within as well as without the wall, belonged to one great parish—a theory which might be strongly defended—it would be worth remarking that while the natural boundaries of the city on the south, the west and the north were sharply defined by the Thames, the Fleet, and the Moor, on the east there was no such definition before the building, or after the destruction, of the wall, until the time of its rebuilding by Alfred; and here, again, we have, as a fact recorded by certain ancient chroniclers, and noticed by Mr. Freeman ('Norman Conquest,' i. 281), that King Alfred built the Tower, or a tower, on the eastern side of London. I do not like without further information to pursue these speculations. If the theory put forward as to the early parochial divisions be unsound, its refutation will at least have elicited some facts which ought to be known, and may clear the

way for a more intelligent view of the beginnings of London history than has yet been attempted.

Some Scandinavian dedications have been connected with Cnut and his family, but on examination they all turn out to be later. Both the saints named, Olaf, one of whom was a contemporary of Sweyn and Cnut, and the other not much earlier, cannot have been specially venerated by a Danish king of England. But, besides the more famous St. Olave's in Southwark, from which 'Tooley Street' is named, there are three city parishes, St. Olave, Hart Street, St. Olave, Old Jewry, and St. Olave, Silver Street. There is no reason to date any of them before the Norman Conquest. St. Magnus, again, only died in 1110, and his church, therefore, must belong to the great church-building epoch of the twelfth century, at the earliest. St. Bride, Fleet Street, is sometimes also called a Danish church; but the Swedish St. Bridget flourished in the fourteenth century; while the church, a chapel of St. Margaret's parish, was in existence before 1222. It is not, therefore, possible to connect any of the supposed Danish dedications in the city with the dynasty of Cnut.

Many of these parish churches were of very modest dimensions, some of them only chapels to the great house by whose lord they were built. The steeple and chancel of All Hallows the Less stood over the gateway of Cold Harbour, the parish being, in fact, the estate of the Pountney family, and divided by them from All Hallows the Great. St. Mary 'Colechurch' was over the gateway of the Hospital of St. Thomas of Acon in Cheap. St. Mildred, Poultry, and St. John were both

built on arches over the Wallbrook. The post-Reformation idea that a church was a congregational meeting-house, or preaching-hall, had not occurred to anyone in London at least; and when further subdivision of parishes became impossible or was forbidden about the middle of the thirteenth century, chantries for mass priests were substituted, and clustered round all the larger parochial and conventual churches, and especially round St. Paul's. A hundred priests were daily employed in the cathedral, fully half of them being attached to altars, and without 'cure of souls.'

I am anxious in so small a book not to meddle more than is absolutely necessary with architecture; but it will help us to realise what London was like in the beginning of the Tudor period, the early years of the sixteenth century which was destined to see such changes, to remember that, with the exception of St. Mary le Bow, which had originally been built in the market-place, perhaps as a 'chapel of ease' to St. Mary Aldermary, and St. Michael upon Cornhill, founded before 1055, no city church was conspicuous for any fine feature. St. Mary's and St. Michael's were both decked with tall towers; the first having the open arches on its summit which were imitated successfully at St. Dunstan's, and which gave their name in one form, 'le Bow,' to the church, and in another, the 'Arches,' to an ecclesiastical court; sometimes also derived from the arched Norman crypt still existing. The fine square tower of St. Michael's was, to use a modern term, 'restored' by Wren, and is far finer now than it was when first built.

But if a distant view of London wanted the variety

and charm which Wren's beautiful parish churches and their steeples give it, the great monastic churches must have gone far to make up for it. The names alone remain to us, with the single exception of Austin Friars, where a 'thoroughly restored' fragment recalls the lament of Stow over the destruction of the chancel and of a noble spire, 'small, high, and straight.' The corporation petitioned Henry VIII. to save the four friars' churches as being suitable for public sermons, but only at the king's death were they partially successful, when the damage done was probably irreparable. Christ Church, Newgate Street, occupies the site of the choir of the Grey Friars, but the Dominican church at Blackfriars, and the Carmelite church at Whitefriars, have both wholly disappeared. Just without the wall on the west the great church of St. Bartholomew, and just within the wall on the east the church of the Holy Trinity, commemorated an earlier wave of reform. If the canons of Aldgate had such architectural skill and ambition as the canons of Smithfield, the loss of their church is all the greater; and it seems strange that the citizens should have done nothing to save the tomb of Henry of Londonstone, their first mayor. Of St. Martin le Grand not a fragment remains above ground; but here, unless some of the Norman buildings survived, the comparative poverty of the house, which, in fact, in its later years became dependent on Westminster Abbey, forbids the idea of any very magnificent buildings. St. Mary Overey in Southwark, another Norman foundation, fared better, as the greater part of the church, which formed for centuries a second church for ceremonial purposes for the bishop of Winchester, was standing

fifty years ago; and the choir with part of an eastern chapel, much modernised, may still be seen, as well as the tomb of Gower, the poet, removed to the south transept from St. John's Chapel, now destroyed. The abbey of 'St. Mary of Graces,' on Tower Hill, the only Cistercian house near London, was founded in 1349, but never flourished; and whether it was reckoned within or without the city, it stood within the old line of the wall, and was popularly known as Eastminster in contrast to Westminster, for before this there was no abbot in London. The Abbey was turned into an Ordnance Office, and was the scene of the labours of the genial and philosophical Samuel Pepys, P.R.S.

There were only two nunneries of importance, St. Helen's Priory, north of St. Helen's Church, near Bishopsgate, and the Priory, or Abbey, of Poor Clares, a Franciscan order of sisters, whose popular name remains in The Minories, and whose head was called an abbess, although belonging to a mendicant order. The oldest foundations, those of St. Paul and St. Martin, were each ruled by a dean. The number of smaller religious houses within the walls was very great. St. Thomas of Acon faced St. Mary le Bow, in Cheap. The friars of the Sack occupied for a short time the site of the Jews' synagogue in Coleman Street. Elsing Spital was near the wall on the north. In the suburban wards of Farringdon and Bishopsgate were other 'spitals,' and the Templars, the Carthusians, the Hospitallers, and the nunnery at Clerkenwell, all stood close to the city Bars.

It was unfortunate, after the suppression of religious houses, that so few of their churches were preserved.

They probably in all cases compared with the churches of the parishes in which they stood, as the gigantic fragment of St. Bartholomew's compares with the little church in the hospital close by. But of the ancient parish churches a very small number survive; and except for their monuments, our loss is not very great. St. Helen's boasts of a 'nun's aisle,' and is therefore more imposing in size than its neighbour St. Ethelburga's. St. Giles Cripplegate was rebuilt after a fire in 1545; and St. Katharine Cree, in Leadenhall Street,—still in the old pointed style,—is almost a hundred years later, having been built under the directions of Bishop Laud. It would be interesting, with a view to judge of the merits of the various attempts to adapt the old style to the requirements of Protestant parochial worship, if we could compare the designs of St. Katharine, St. Sepulchre, St. Alban Wood Street, said to have been rebuilt by Wren on the lines of an older church by Inigo Jones, and St. Mary Aldermary. The delicate, shallow mouldings of Wren's classical style are nearly lost in his Gothic; but a tradition of pointed architecture lingered, it is evident, even in London, till the beginning of the last century.

In the sketch I have here attempted, there is no continuous history of the relations of Church and State in London. A history of the diocese has yet to be written; a history of St. Paul's, notwithstanding what a late dean accomplished, is still needed. But the church in London may be taken as a type of the church all over the kingdom. The early period, before the great churches withdrew their clergy from the missionary work for which they were founded, is well illus-

trated in St. Paul's and St. Martin's with their canons and prebendal estates. The second period—which some have dated from the year 1000, and the passing away of the gloom and apprehension which affected the minds of men who thought the end of the world was to come in that year—commenced with the great increase of zeal among the laity and the building of parish churches. It culminated in the establishment of the friars, whose work commended itself at first to every religious mind. As the mendicant orders declined from their early activity and followed the monks and canons of older orders into retirement, the great epidemics which ravaged Europe led to the foundation of an infinite number of chantries with mass priests—the last development of the medieval religion in London. With the suppression, first of the monks and friars, then of the chantries, and guilds, another attempt to awaken religious zeal was made; and the central Puritan idea, that preaching is the chief end for which a church should be adapted, had a powerful effect on London. The city clergy were not accustomed to deliver sermons; and before the Civil Wars every parish that could afford it had supplied the place occupied in an earlier generation by the chantry priest with an 'evening or a morning lecturer.' After the Great Fire the congregational convenience of large churches led to the combination of several parishes—to reverse, no doubt unconsciously, the work of the twelfth century in multiplying small places of worship—and the genius of the greatest English architect was called in to give the world a series of models of unapproached beauty and convenience, designed, not like

the old churches, for the celebration of mass at many altars, not like Laud's St. Katharine Cree, for the celebration of Anglican service, but with the object of accommodating the largest number of hearers within sight of the pulpit.

CHAPTER VIII.

LONDON TRADE.

The Growth of Suburbs attributable to Trade—Early Security of London—The Port—Foreigners in London—Teutonic Element—Normans and Germans—French Trade—Supremacy of London—Its Influence—The Control of the Thames—The Guilds and Trades—Modern Isolation of the City.

THE unexampled growth of the London suburbs must be attributed ultimately to the wealth of the little city which forms their centre. Wealth founded on commerce, and commerce on security, have attracted population, and with population has come the seat of government itself. London can only in a sense be termed the capital of England, and it is more than three hundred years since a parliament assembled in the city; but the king's courts were fixed at Westminster in 1224, and though, no doubt, it was the security of the walls which in troubled times attracted the king, there are no walls at Westminster. On the other hand, it is not far from London; and though there has been no king's palace in the city since at the latest the days of Cnut, if we except the Tower, still, because London resisted the worst inroads of the Danes after the restoration of its defences by Alfred, the early kings came by degrees to look upon it as the headquarters of the kingdom, especially after Win-

chester had been surrendered to Swegn. The possession of wealth enabled the citizens to keep their walls in repair, and safety brought more wealth. The invader was sometimes bought off; but except in peace he never entered. During the Danish devastations, therefore, London was the residence and refuge of one king after another; and, as I hope to show in another chapter, it generally came to pass that to possess the confidence of the Londoners was to possess the kingdom.

The same causes which during the centuries of Danish rapine made London a safe residence, made it also secure as a mercantile depository. The wealth of the city,—in comparison at least with the wealth of any other part of the kingdom,—was practically undiminished—possibly increased—when the long peace, the blessed 'T. R. E.' of Domesday, began.

To this security was added the advantage of geographical position. The Thames, still tidal, yet landlocked and smooth, sixty miles from the sea; the Lea, whose canal-like stream was navigable far up among the woods of Hertfordshire; the Fleet, a harbour for the smaller craft; and the mouth of the Wallbrook at Dowgate, where a dock was easily formed and its depth controlled by the 'boat-hatch' still commemorated in the name of the neighbouring church, St. Mary-Bothaw: such were the advantages of the site of London for water carriage. When roads were, as a rule, only rough, narrow tracks for pack horses; when even the streets of towns were not made for traffic on wheels; when the transport of heavy goods or building materials was, in fact, only possible in floating vessels, such a site was attractive to the merchant. Moreover, London, unlike

the greatest commercial cities of northern Europe at the time, was rarely subject to any inundation, standing so close to the water yet so well above high-water mark. All the region round was productive of cattle and hogs, of timber and fodder, so that without any cultivation there was still something to sell to the merchant, and the port must, therefore, in the absence of danger from the Norsemen, have been convenient and safe.

These were the times, doubtless, of which Bæda speaks, and for which the laws of the kings of Kent were framed. Bæda, referring back to a period long anterior to his own,—he is believed to have died in 731,—praises the happy situation of London, on the banks of the Thames, and calls it the 'emporium' of many nations,—an expression which King Alfred translated by 'Ceapstow;' and the laws attributed to Hlothhære and Eadric, who reigned towards the end of the seventh century, and whose next successor, Wihtred, is sometimes said to have been the founder of St. Martin le Grand, in London, make express mention of *Lunden-Wic*. This must be the '*Ceap-stow*' of Bæda and Alfred; and at least shows that without the protection of adequate walls, such as may be supposed to have arisen before London is called *Lunden-byrig*, merchants and sellers of country produce resorted to its market-place. They used, doubtless, the quay referred to in another form of the name, for Æthelbald of Mercia speaks of *Lunden-tune's hythe* in 743. *Londen-wic* is again named in a charter, of doubtful authenticity, in 761. But from the beginning of the ninth century the trade of London is more and more often and distinctly mentioned; the sea-faring merchant is recognised; the commerce of

the Continent is classified; and the customs gradually become of such importance as to be worthy of special regulations. Eadgar was the first king who recognised the importance of the foreign trade of London to the kingdom at large; and the laws of Æthelred, his son, mention expressly the chief kinds of merchandise and the chief places from which they came.

The freedom which admitted strangers and foreigners of all kinds to live and trade in the city, nay, to make it their home and that of their posterity, is not easily defined. But we have many kinds of evidence to prove that, beside such exclusive corporations as the Steelyard, the commercial advantages of London attracted settlers, especially from the Teutonic nations of the opposite coast. A considerable body of German merchants came to London and either did not join any special 'Guildhall' or left it after a brief sojourn, and became to all intents the same as born citizens. No Germans are mentioned in William's charter, no Lotharingians or Easterlings. They may have been counted as English. The burghers whom he addresses were a mixed multitude, chiefly of what, for want of a better name, must be described as Teutonic origin. They came from Upper Lorraine as well as Lower Lorraine; they were men of Cologne, of Liège and Nivelle; of what we call Holland and what we call Belgium. But the oldest authorities, William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon, for example, name the German merchants and the silver they brought. The 'French' of William's charter were rather the Norman settlers—speakers of French—the kindred of the High Dutch and the Low Dutch—rather than any Celtic or Gallic race such as we

should now designate as French. The personal names quoted in a former chapter as among the earliest we can find would prove this: and though the Norman French made 'De' and 'Fitz' as common in London as 'sune' and 'of,' the names themselves are what we should now describe as purely German, and even an exhaustive list would fail to produce a single Scotch, Irish, Welsh, or Gaulish name upon which we could fix with certainty till near the end of the thirteenth century. Constantine, the alderman who was hanged in 1222, was the son of Athulf (Adolf), the son of Fromund: Azo was the son of Reinmund; Arnald was the son of Thedmar (Theodmar). It is, of course, difficult to distinguish between names of German origin and names which resemble them in old English—between the High Dutch and the Low Dutch forms—but there can be little doubt, I think, that the early merchants of London admitted, almost if not quite, on equal terms, men of other so-called Teutonic nations, and that the prohibitions and restrictions which the legislation of a later age imposed on 'aliens' had but little force before the Conquest and for many years later. Norman merchandise came to London, and Norman merchants settled in London, long before the Norman invasion: and the men of Rouen and Caen were as familiar in the streets and markets as the men of Flanders or of the Rhine.

The external trade was largely fostered in its early growth by political events abroad: the extensive continental dominions of the Angevin kings, and the liberal policy of Henry II., in particular, towards the Rhine merchants, whom he encouraged and protected in their 'Gildhalda Theutonicorum' in London—which

Dr. Pauli, by the way, seems to think was the Guildhall of the corporation, and which others have identified with the Steelyard. It would be safe to doubt either assignment; but, in the absence of proof, we may certainly assume that any foreign city wealthy enough could, and probably did, set up its storehouse in London, although that of the Hanseatic League is now chiefly remembered. The troubles of the Empire, and the warm participation of Richard I. and John in the political struggles of the Germans, brought increased custom to London. In the beginning of his reign John promised safe conducts, through the mayor and commonalty of London, to foreign merchants, the only condition made being in a kind of 'reciprocity' clause. The men of other nations coming to London were to be treated as their countrymen treated the London traveller abroad. The defeat of John at Bouvines seems to have drawn the Rhenish trade, rather than the French, to England, and the closer alliance was signalised by the election of Richard of Cornwall 'to be King of the Romans.' Henry III. gave exclusive privileges to the Steelyard, to the injury, no doubt for a time, of English trade; but the virtual monopoly by the Hanse merchants of the northern ports drove the London shipowners to the southward; and their courageous enterprise sent fleets to Bordeaux and even to Lisbon, where the London crusaders had already helped to drive out the Moors. In the lists of London mayors, as has been frequently noticed, Henry 'le Waleys' must be identified with Henry 'le Gallois,' who figures, under the year 1275, among the mayors of Bordeaux.

The story of London's commercial supremacy has

been often told; and I have no need to recapitulate it here. It only dates, as we know it, from the reign of Queen Elizabeth; but the earlier growth has been detailed by many competent hands. Mr. Green and Dr. Pauli, for instance, have sketched its political aspects, Mr. Capper and Sir Theodore Martin its mercantile development. The reciprocity which, as I have said, first shows itself under John, was always the chief principle of London commercial policy. What was extended at first to foreign nations was soon, as the internal trade of the country grew, extended also to other English cities. When a Londoner set forth on his travels he took letters with him in which the mayor, aldermen, and commonalty desired the authorities of those cities and towns through which he should pass to receive him with his merchandise free from all manner of toll or custom, 'according to the franchise of the city of London.' Dr. Sharpe, in an interesting volume printed from letters in the possession of the city, has given many examples of this kind dating from the reign of Edward III. In some of them reprisals are threatened where a citizen has been denied reasonable redress. Thus, a letter to the mayor and commonalty of Bristol warns them that if justice is not done in the matter of some wool which had been seized from Andrew Aubrey, a citizen of London, 'necessity would certainly arise for annoying their citizens coming to London;' and the settlement of such questions, coupled with the custom which existed in many English cities to refer municipal disputes to the corporation of London, a custom which grew up, no doubt, from the clause in certain charters in which liberties 'the same

as the liberties of London' were granted, drew English cities together by the similarity of interests. A number of the letters in Dr. Sharpe's collection relate to the want of labour and other difficulties which arose after the visitation of the Black Death in 1349. But the mayor and commons of London did not confine their lectures to the home cities. They cajoled and threatened Bruges and Ghent, Calais and Amiens, Bordeaux, and even Florence, in a similar manner; and their consciousness of power seems to have sprung from no mere boasting spirit, but from the deference which was paid to their opinion and the advantages which were derived from enjoying their favour.

These historical facts seem to resolve themselves into a single proposition which is variously stated, but which comes out best from a contrast drawn between the fate of the great commercial cities of Western Europe, and that of London, a contrast whose central feature is involved in the comparative financial freedom of London as regards the arbitrary and temporary circumstances of the rulers of the kingdom at large. The great republics, the free cities of Italy, of Flanders, of Germany, all, more or less, suffered under the same disadvantage as compared with London. They only held command of their purse-strings for a time. Sooner or later, all had to bow to what may have been a political necessity consequent on geographical situation among contending nations, or to some inherent defect of constitution which eventually placed the merchant at the mercy of the tyrant or the soldier. In London, on the contrary, from the time of Cressy to that of Waterloo, at least, the victory was with the

provider of resources; the king who had the city with him did not need to count the cost. No powerful ruler could exist without the help of the burgher. There is a kind of uniformity in our annals in this respect. Alfred and Henry I., Edward I. and Edward III., Henry V. and Edward IV., to mention only a few out of many, showed the way to Elizabeth and Cecil. The plunder of the citizens, the interference of weak and vacillating counsels, and consequent decline of mercantile wealth and destruction of confidence, have had, whoever the king or the minister, the same result. The long reign of Henry III., for example, may be divided into periods. Prosperity came to him when Hubert, or Simon, ruled for him and ensured the confidence of the citizens. His quarrels with London, disastrous as they were to the city, were even more so to its oppressor. Edward II., Richard II., Henry VI., Charles I., James II., all could tell the same tale, and it might be prolonged in the history of successive ministries since the establishment of responsible government. An agent of the Bank of England was with the army of William III. in Flanders; and during the long war with Napoleon victory inclined to the providers of magnificent subsidies.

But these are results which have been noticed so often that I need only mention them in passing. It would be more satisfactory to try and discover even a few of the local causes of London's commercial supremacy; circumstances, some of which would, taken singly, have been insufficient to account for the result, but which, taken together, are well worth noting. One of them was the control of the Thames, acquired by the city at a very early period. The civic authorities

claimed jurisdiction over all that could be called the Port. We first hear of the Nore (New Weir) in the will of Eadmer Anhænde, who left it to Rochester. It was a fishing place on the Medway, and the port was reckoned in the reign of Richard I. to extend from Staines to the Medway. When distinctions between the 'legal port' and the limits of the Thames Conservancy began to be made for the purposes of import duty, the port was held to extend to Greenwich. This was in the reign of Edward I., and other definitions were subsequently made. Gravesend was long, and is still in many particulars, considered the entrance of the port, as regards revenue, sanitary and other arrangements; but for my present purpose it is sufficient to point out that just as the port of Bremen is considered to reach to the mouth of the Weser, or Hamburg to the mouth of the Elbe, so the port of London extends to the North Foreland; and the Thames Conservancy remained formally in the hands of the corporation till 1857, when its powers were delegated, under an Act of Parliament, to a mixed commission, of which, however, the Lord Mayor is, by virtue of his civic office, the chairman.

It is not necessary here to detail the effects of this long-continued jurisdiction. By itself, it could not have created London; for similar powers, nearly if not quite as ancient, have not saved other commercial cities from obscurity. The power of the Thames was coupled in the case of London with the maritime courage and enterprise of the citizens. The men who ventured in their little 'hatch-boats,' half decked over, perhaps, across the Bay of Biscay to Bordeaux and Bayonne and

even, it seems, round the coast of Spain to Genoa, before the fourteenth century, proved their right to rule in their own river. When, in 1377, a Scottish pirate harassed the east coast, and no royal fleet was at hand to attack him, John Philpot, an alderman—he is commemorated by the name of a city street, in which his house once stood—collected the Thames sailors to the number of a thousand men, put to sea and captured the marauder. In spite of his success, Philpot was censured by the council; and this is an extreme case: but the freedom of the Thames was a matter of life and death to the citizens. A confirmation or definition of the Thames Conservancy made by James I. probably gave rise to the story that a certain Lord Mayor, in 'a factious saying,' informed the king that he might remove the court if he would leave the river. The great operations of recent years, the abolition of various restrictions imposed, some by the Custom-house, some by the city itself, some by the assertion of vested or prescriptive rights, and the opening of greater and yet greater docks for the reception of ships engaged in foreign trade, have grown out of, or been caused by, the influence of the city on the river. The amount of shipping which now enters the Thames far exceeds that of any other harbour in the world, and year by year, in spite of periodical depressions, docks, larger and larger, are made further and further down on both banks towards the open sea. The camp of Elizabeth, the fort and its old gate which Wren built under the direction of Pepys, now mark the latest extension of the port, and Tilbury, like Gravesend on the opposite bank, is only one of the latest additions to the number of London suburbs.

Another very potent element among the causes of London commercial prosperity was the comparatively peaceful attitude of the craftsmen during the Angevin and Tudor reigns. Outbursts did occur, brief riots, faction fights between the champions of rival trades; yet no great commercial city of the same time was so smoothly and evenly governed. Wat Tyler and Jack Cade came from without. There is no parallel between the destructions they wrought in London and those wrought over and over again in the great cities of the Continent, and especially of France, by uprisings of the people of the place. This, I think, may be attributed in great part to the organisation of the guilds and trades.

A majority of the guilds must have been formed among the men of certain trades working in the same quarter of the city. In spite of much research, we know very little or nothing of their internal regulations before the time when they were about to lose their guild identity in the later institution of chartered companies. I cannot recognise in the modern representatives of these companies a succession which some of them claim from the guilds of the trades and crafts of the thirteenth century. The modern successors of the trade guilds are rather to be found in companies of 'merchant adventurers,' such as were the East India Company, the Russia Company, the still subsisting and trading Hudson's Bay Company, for example. But the organisation, whatever it was, which Walter Hervey gave to the craftsmen, 'by their trades,' was long before the charters which the kings granted to the great city companies, and the two were only accidentally connected, as I venture to think. 'The trades' of which we read were, no doubt, wholly

made up of members of guilds: but when a guild belonging to a trade, or two or more guilds in the same trade, brought men together in peace, showed them the advantages of co-operation, helped to smooth without obliterating rivalry; and when the men thus associated registered their trade regulations at the Guildhall and had them approved at the hustings, their principal work, commercially speaking, was done. The next step, that of obtaining incorporation from the sovereign, and the further, and even more important step, of obtaining recognition as the dispensers of the city franchise, changed their whole character. The trade or craft was eventually forgotten, the abolition of guilds in 1557 removed the older element; and in the result, except in two or three cases, the modern city companies, while they have retained the power conferred on them by the mistaken interpretation of an ancient custom, of admitting to the freedom of the city, have no necessary connection with city trade. Their work was done, however, before the dawn of the seventeenth century. The ages of revolution and transition had been tided over in comparative quietness. The government of London rested on a broad base, though the power was in a few hands, and it is probably as much to this ancient tradition of security as to anything else that the subsequent commercial prosperity is due.

The livery companies, with their political and municipal power, are, so far as I can ascertain, peculiar to London. No other city has permitted such a development of its misteries and trades, nowhere else in England have chartered associations of the kind attained such wealth and power. The very word 'mistery,' often

misspelled 'mystery,' implies skilled knowledge or 'mastery,' of a branch of industrial art. This mastery was nowhere else more fully acknowledged and respected. This was in part accidental, but it worked well for centuries; and has largely influenced the modern history of London. But the organisation of the misteries and crafts had preceded it; and, so far as the history of that organisation can now be examined, it seems to have had the most beneficial effect on the competitive interests of different classes.

There have been many treatises and many theories as to guilds. It is not easy to decide how far they were religious, how far they were commercial, or how far they are to be identified with those unions of the men of certain trades which have, by most modern writers, been counted as the same. Putting aside theories, and merely looking at the facts of history, and chiefly at the facts of London history, we find municipal guilds accepting charters and receiving a town or a city in farm; we find also companies of tradesmen and craftsmen accepting charters; and beside both we have guilds, licensed or unlicensed, and, in one instance only in London, also accepting charters.

It is very desirable to keep these three sets of facts distinct in our minds. They were curiously mixed up by Herbert, the only writer who essayed a complete history of the London Livery Companies. He uses the word 'guild' indiscriminately with trade, mistery, craft, and company, and thereby causes great confusion. So does an older author, Strype, who in his edition of Stow, tells us that Edward III. adressed a charter to 'the Guild or Fraternity of the Skinners of London.'

Yet the original charter says nothing about either Guild or Fraternity, and is simply addressed to 'men of the City of London called Skinners.' I do not mention this as a matter of criticism, but as a matter of history. In the so-called 'Gothic revival' of a few years ago, the medieval idea of guildship was seized with avidity, and we have now numerous guilds of recent establishment, and have also the old city companies claiming to be guilds. I have already said something on this subject; and it is only needful here to point out the difficulty, and the reason of the difficulty, of arriving at a true estimate of the influence of the guilds and companies, the trades and misteries, in averting the fate which overtook almost all the great manufacturing and commercial cities of Europe sooner or later.

The curious interpretation of the charter of 1475, which was sanctioned apparently by the Act of 1725, and which gave the companies a power they do not seem to have enjoyed elsewhere, had, no doubt, a great effect in helping London to survive the revolutions of foreign and civil war, the loss thrown upon the middle classes by the suppression of religious houses and guilds, and the effects of four calamities which followed closely on each other's heels—the plague, the fire, the closing of the exchequer, and the tyranny of James II. Political and commercial life went on, and the greatest misfortunes that could befall a city failed to ruin London. It is not possible to account for this marvellous vitality unless we allow something for the characteristics on which Englishmen are apt to pride themselves; but even courage and common sense require nourishment to

sustain them, and that sustentation must come, as I have endeavoured to show, partly from the geographical and natural position of the place, and partly from the sense of security which internal peace, fostered by the organisation of the trades and misteries, preserved for the city through periods of revolution and transition.

The modern history of London offers a further consideration which should not be overlooked. The prosperity of London was founded by its carrying trade, it became the market-place of the world; it is now the centre of financial power. This last phase has been entered upon since the beginning of the eighteenth century; and here we are brought face to face with what might be considered a most extraordinary fact. The population has steadily, and indeed rapidly, declined for many years. For five hundred people who were in London at the accession of Queen Anne there are not fifty now. Yet though the city is deserted, its centrifugal force is like that of some great planet. The units that fly off continue attached as rings round the body of their parent world. The suburbs of London exceed the original city in size and population many hundred times: to the politician this anomaly presents a problem for solution; to the historian it is interesting as being probably without an exact parallel in the world. The isolation of the city and its rulers as such from suburban and provincial interests and cares, whether we view it with favour or disfavour, is a fact; and without pronouncing any political opinion upon it, we cannot but perceive that it has been one of the causes both of the unbounded wealth of London, and also of the uncontrolled extension

of the suburbs. That London and its suburbs are well, cheaply, and wholesomely governed as compared with other cities no one can deny; but it must be remembered that there is no other city which can be compared with London on equal terms. What London could not do for itself the suburbs have done, and the iron band of ecclesiastical estates has been broken through. The parishes and manors which prevented the city from surrounding itself with organised wards have been passed by; some of them remain unbuilt upon to this day, and the loss of one age has been the gain of another; but the suburbs have spread beyond the parks, and even in times of depression and comparative poverty they continue to spread, the immediate and proximate cause of their recent development being the extension of the railway system. The city merchant lives perhaps on the coast of Sussex, or among the Chiltern Hills, and the number of tradesmen whose residence is still over their counting-house diminishes year by year. What Cheap was to all the city in the thirteenth century, when the shopkeepers lived out at 'Stebney, Stratford, and Hakeneye,' the city is to all 'the metropolitan area' now, a market-place, a bank, an isolated region, sacred to 'business,' that chief object of the veneration of Englishmen.

CHAPTER IX.

LONDON AND THE KINGDOM.

The Place of London in English History—The Election of Kings—Mr. Green's Account of the Election of Stephen—Mr. Thorold Rogers on the Influence of London—Mr. Freeman on the Rights of London—Meetings of the Witan in London—The First Election of an English King in London—The 'Lithsmen' at Oxford—Later London Elections—The last Witenagemot—The Story of the Revolution in London—Lord Mayor Chapman—The Arrest of Jeffreys—Political Effect of Chapman's Illness—The Grant of a Loan to William—Definition of the Place of London in the Events of 1688—London compared with Paris—Scope and Limitation of this Book—Summary—The End.

THERE is something so exceptional in the political, or I may say, constitutional, position of London in the kingdom, that it has been noticed by writers of all shades and parties. The idea that England has a written, cut-and-dry constitution, like that drawn up every ten years or so for France, or that granted by a German prince to his subjects, has taken firm hold of the minds of people who ought to know better, and especially of our parliamentary legislators, so that I shall probably be told London has no place set apart for it, no rights differing from those of any other city, no influence which does not belong to it on account of its present wealth and size. But among all the anomalies which

puzzle the English constitutionalist, none is more difficult to define, none, at the same time, more certainly in existence, than that which has so often made London the arbiter of the destinies of England. Just now, when such claims would scarcely have a chance of recognition, and when, as might be supposed after a superficial survey, the city is shrinking more and more within itself, and taking less and less notice of the doings of the outer world, the real influence of London, not on England only, but on all Europe, I had almost said, on all the world, is absolutely supreme. No potentate inspires half the deference which is offered to the financial power of London. The more widely that power is acknowledged the better for the peace of nations; or, to put it differently, the most autocratic sovereign has to reckon with the burgesses of London.

There is so much difficulty in stating the case as to the political position of London in English history, that I will venture to quote two or three passages from competent and unprejudiced writers, showing what is the nature of the real or imaginary claim which has been made on behalf of London.

One of the late Mr. Green's first historical essays was on the election of King Stephen by the citizens of London. A paper read at the London congress of an archæological society was subsequently worked into the 'History of the English People.' In the election of a king, he said, London had long taken a great constitutional part. 'The voice of her citizens had long been accepted as representative of the popular assent in the election of a king.' When Æthelred died 'all the witan that were in London, and the burgesses chose Eadmund to be their

king,' says the chronicle. On the death of Cnut, the citizens joined with the Danes in raising Harold Harefoot to the throne in opposition to Harthacnut. The burgesses and butsecarls had united with Archbishop Ealdred in the vain attempt to make 'a king of the Etheling after the fatal defeat of Hastings. By the time of the Conquest, London had become the definite place of the royal election,' says Mr. Green in the paper above mentioned. In the 'History' he continues, speaking of Stephen, 'it marks the progress of English independence under Henry that London now claimed of itself the right of election. Undismayed by the absence of the hereditary counsellors of the Crown, its aldermen and wise folk gathered together the folk-moot, and these providing at their own will for the good of the realm unanimously resolved to choose a king.' This passage is translated from the 'Gesta Stephani,' where the original uses the words 'majores natu' for the 'aldermen' of Mr. Green's version. In the poem on the Conquest by Guy of Amiens there is a similar expression, which Mr. Freeman ('Norman Conquest,' iii. 546) would also be inclined to render 'aldermen.'

A very different writer, Mr. Rogers (in his 'British Citizen,' p. 65) thus describes the position of London in respect to the rest of the realm:—'Whichever side London took was victorious in the end, and sometimes quickly. The Conqueror treated it with marked favour. It put Stephen on the throne. It had a great hand in forcing John to sign the Great Charter. It took the lead in resisting the mismanagement of his son. It deposed Edward II. (1327), Richard II. (1399), and Henry VI. (1461). It raised Richard III. (1483) to

the throne. It took the side of the Parliament against Charles, and it was really the strength which deposed his son James. The city of London put the House of Hanover on the throne and kept it there.'

The question is somewhat differently stated by Mr. Freeman in the 'History of the Norman Conquest' (v. 411). Here the rights of London are associated with those of other great cities. The author, in speaking of the development of parliamentary institutions, shows that beside the 'landsitting men' of the early gemót there was another element, that of the citizens and burgesses. 'We have seen in the days of Stephen the citizens of London and Winchester make good their ancient right to a voice in the choosing and deposing of kings. Presently that right, in itself somewhat vague and precarious, was merged by the act of the great Simon in the general right of the citizens and burgesses of England to appear by their representatives alongside of the Witan and the landsitting men. Yet that right did not wholly die out; the tradition of it lived on to appear in after times, twice in a tumultuous, once in a more regular form. Edward IV. and Richard III. were called to the crown, no less than Stephen, by the voice of the citizens of London. And in the Assembly which called on William of Orange to take on himself the provisional government of the kingdom, along with the Lords and the members of the former parliaments, the citizens of London had their place as of old.'

After reading such passages, which might be considerably multiplied, it would be interesting to go over all the recorded instances in which the city of London interfered directly in the affairs of the kingdom: such a

survey would be the history of England as seen from the windows of the Guildhall; but it will be enough for my present purpose to select a few examples as typical.

Thus, though parliaments have rarely been held in London, there are many instances of the assembling of the wise men of the kingdom—of the Witan—within the walls, in days before formally constituted parliaments were summoned. Kemble enumerates ('Anglo-Saxons,' ii. 241) all the meetings of the Witan of which he could find mention, but to go no further back than the reign of Æthelstan, a king whose name survived for many centuries in the city traditions, we read of a gemót held in London on June 7, 934; of another under Eadmund, and a third under Eadgar, in 966. This last named king held a 'great gemót' in St. Paul's Church in 973, the year of his late coronation at Bath. When Æthelred, his 'unready' son, had no kingdom but London, they became more and more frequent, and were, we may be sure, often held in St. Paul's, like that memorable meeting, more than two centuries later, when Simon of Montfort presented Henry III. to the people, and Thomas, the mayor, spoke bravely on behalf of the city. There was a great meeting at Easter 1012, when money was voted to buy off the Danes, who just a week later murdered Archbishop Alphage (Ælfheah) in their hustings at Greenwich, almost in sight of the affrighted king and his burghers, as they counted the gold stored within their impregnable wall.

This is a period of great importance in the history of London. Henceforth it is, if not the capital or the metropolis, by far the most influential city in England.

It is marked by the year 1016, which affords us the first example of a royal election in London. The power of the city had been growing every year during this last most terrible of Danish wars. In the beginning of 1016 the old king Æthelred was lying ill at Corsham, in Wiltshire: his son Eadmund was doing what he could to gather an army against the marauder. But when his forces assembled they demanded, first, that the king himself should lead them, and secondly, that they should have the support of the citizens of London. The Ætheling and his army were apparently near Cricklade, where the Danes had crossed the Thames; Æthelred was to the westward, at Corsham; and the Londoners ascending the river, the four powers, namely, the king, his son, the citizens and the northern army, met and immediately separated again, the king going, not unwillingly, with the citizens to take refuge behind their walls. A few weeks later Æthelred died in London, where his son, Eadmund, having meanwhile been foiled in his attempts to raise Northumbria, had joined the king. Æthelred was buried in St. Paul's. Cnut and his Danes with their English allies drawing nearer every day: and 'all the witan that were in London,' says the Chronicle, 'and the burghers (burhwaru) chose Eadmund for king.' He was crowned beside his father's new-made grave by Archbishop Lyfing.

There is much more which must be passed by about London in this connection: how Cnut and his men made their famous canal round Southwark; how Eadmund marched and counter-marched to relieve the city; how battles were lost or won; and other events, which

have been fully detailed elsewhere, ending, in the words of the Chronicle, with the final closing of the Danish forces round London, which was beset 'both by water and by land; but Almighty God saved it.' The subsequent triumph of Cnut was won peaceably as far as London is concerned. The burghers paid for their share of the indemnity no less than 'xi thusand punda,' out of the seventy-two thousand imposed on the whole realm—or, according to some MSS., 'ten and a half.'

In the election of Harold, the son of Cnut, at Oxford in 1035, we read of the assembly of the Witan, that it was composed of the earl Leofric and almost all the thegns north of the Thames, and 'the lithsmen of London.' Lithsmen are simply 'shipsmen,' seafarers, perhaps, though not certainly, those great London merchants who by their voyages across the sea were entitled under the old English law to rank and vote with the thegns. The word 'lithsmen' occurs several times in the Chronicle; it sometimes seems to denote merely sailors, and sometimes, as in a passage about the burial of Beorn in 1048—where the words 'of London' are added—seems to denote men who were the companions, perhaps the equals in influence, of the earls and thegns who figure so largely during the last years of the old kingdom. It is going too far to assume that the words 'lithsmen of London,' in the Oxford assembly, denote the men 'worthy of thegn-right,' by reason of their successful expeditions as merchants; but it would be going still further to assume that they were turbulent sailors, men who overawed the assembly by their display of physical power and united action. While, therefore, the 'lithsmen of London' formed a class of influence,

we must not press too far, in the present state of our knowledge, any argument derived from a connection, which may be purely accidental, between the concession of thegn-right to merchants, and the appearance of London sailors among the earls and thanes in the constituent assembly at Oxford in 1035. Unquestionably, however, the place occupied in the election of 1016 by the burghers is now occupied by the lithsmen; but while the election of Eadmund took place in London, that of Harold took place at Oxford: the Londoners who attended must have gone by way of the river in their 'liths,' and the description applied to them may be what modern writers would call 'a touch of local colour,' a distinction drawn between the northern thegns with their soldiers, and the London burghers with their sailors.

It will be better, therefore, not to press too far any inference from this Oxford Witenagemot as to the claim of London to a special voice in the election of kings. At the utmost it would only come to this, that a man worthy to attend as a thegn was not excluded because his thegn right was acquired 'in commercial pursuits.'

It is very evident that, when a meeting like this took place in a great city, the men of that city had a preponderating voice in the result. The burghers of Winchester had a specially large representation at the hasty assembly of 'the witan who were then near at hand,' when Henry I. was elected after the death of the Red King; and the men of London, in the same way, had their turn when Henry died. It happened that few of the barons were present, and the voice of the people was chiefly heard; but we must remember that those

were days before formally constituted parliaments, and before England was largely populated; that the assembly which could be gathered in a few minutes at the western end of the London market-place, within the walls, would probably far exceed in number and intelligence, as well as in wealth and military power, any assembly likely to be gathered elsewhere in England at the time; and that even an irregular election, with but few of the ordinary Witan present, would, if supported by so numerous a body of burghers, have every chance of ultimate success. The king elected by London would be the king elected by the largest body of qualified electors which could be got together in an emergency. We can judge, therefore, whether there was an inherent right of election in London, or not; the election made in London stood because no one could dispute it. I have already mentioned the election of Stephen.

The whole history of the Wars of the Roses, from the first quarrel between Richard II. and the House of Lancaster, turned on the attitude assumed by London. The Londoners did not so much love Lancaster as they hated the arbitrary and uncertain policy of Richard. The rebellion of Wat Tyler, like that of Jack Cade three reigns later, was but a symptom of the general misery and discontent, and though both affected London, it was, if I may use the phrase, topographically and not politically. Far more important in reality were such acts as the arbitrary imposition of Whittington as mayor on the death of Adam Bamme in 1397; the extortion of blank 'charters' or cheques for money; and the indignant rejection of a petition for the lightening of taxation on the king's alliance with France. When

Lancaster landed in July 1399, he was at once assured of a welcome in London; his soldiers were subsidised and provisioned by the citizens, and when the wretched king had been taken in Wales and brought to London, and had resigned his crown to Henry in the Tower, some of the citizens, it is said, petitioned that he should be put to death.

The House of Lancaster was secure so long as it retained the affections of London. The story told of other sovereigns and other merchants, and repeated about Henry V. and Whittington, as to the burning of bonds, is improbable, but suffices to show us wherein the popularity of the family consisted. The French war, the triumph of Agincourt, the king's marriage, these and other events of the kind both caused a more rapid circulation of money and merchandise, and also tended to improve English credit abroad. London was rich and prosperous when the funeral of Henry V. passed through the weeping crowds to the chapel of the Confessor at Westminster, and the long disastrous reign of Henry VI. commenced. Soon mercantile enterprise languished, and credit failed; rival factions plotted to seize the city; shops were shut; and large sums had to be raised for defence. A temporary improvement at the time of Henry's marriage was followed by deeper depression. War broke out with the Duke of Burgundy, and the defence of Calais fell heavily on the citizens, to whose minds the possession of both sides of the channel seemed a necessity. The king and queen had no child, and men looked in vain hither and thither for some sign of the approach of a strong or settled government. This Henry VI. could not give them. They hoped much

from 'Good Duke Humphrey' of Gloucester, the king's uncle; but he was murdered, and two months later his rival, Beaufort, also disappeared from the scene. The queen, Margaret of Anjou, knew not how important London was to her husband's throne. She despised the merchants and their counsel, looking on them merely as providers of money for the exigencies of the kingdom. This was no doubt the real cause of the citizen's affection for the House of York. The title, heraldically speaking, of Henry VI. to sit on the throne of the Edwards was no worse but rather better than that of his father; but to the Londoners a vacillating and insecure policy at home and abroad meant, as it would still mean, loss in credit and in trade. They turned with hope to the Duke of York, and their final acknowledgment of his claims to their support was precipitated by an event curiously parallel to that which had the effect of driving out a later Duke of York, and of refuting once for all the heraldic idea of regal succession. When James, Duke of York, succeeded Charles II. he had no son. When after a few years a son was born, the people could no longer postpone their decision. In 1453, the Londoners, who had accepted Richard Duke of York as heir to the weak Henry, saw all their hopes defeated by the birth of Edward, the ill-fated prince, killed or murdered at Tewkesbury in 1471. From that year their fidelity to York, and after his death to his son, afterwards Edward IV., was unswerving, and it was to London and to the favour and support of the citizens that he owed his success. The mercantile body recognised the advantages of his alliances in Flanders. Warwick, his chief adherent, was popular in the city, if

only for holding Calais, and defeating a Spanish fleet; and when Queen Margaret threatened to punish the city for its favour to the Yorkists her cause was lost. The young duke reached London on February 28, 1461, and lodged at his mother's house in the ward of Castle Baynard—the house which, as we have seen, was wrongly named Baynard's Castle—and after certain constitutional formalities here and a meeting of the council, the people were assembled in Smithfield—the place of the old Folkmote had long become too small—and Edward having been duly presented to them was hailed king by that voice of the citizens which had called so many of his ancestors to the throne.

The election of Richard III. was equally formal, but not equally enthusiastic. The most interesting feature about it was the great importance attached to the approval of the citizens. Richard had the financial instinct of his family, and to him it mattered little at this crisis whether people and parliament and foreign sovereigns were against him, if he could reckon on the support of the Londoners, whose coffers Edward's policy had filled. But the affection of the citizens was transferred on Edward's death to his children rather than to his brother. Richard endeavoured in vain to conjure up some of the enthusiasm of 1461. The efforts of Shaw (the mayor), and of Shaw's brother, who preached a political sermon at St. Paul's Cross, were unsuccessful. Dr. Shaw's peroration, in the midst of which Richard was to have made his appearance, missed fire; the people would not accept the duke as king by acclamation. Next day a meeting at Guildhall, called by the mayor, aldermen, and principal citizens at the instance

of Henry Stafford, Duke of Buckingham, was addressed by the duke, the mayor, and the recorder, the most interesting sentence in the speeches being that in which Buckingham assured the citizens that if they did not hasten to decide one way or other the Lords and Commons would determine the matter without them. Accordingly, after a very lukewarm assent had been wrung from the unwilling burgesses, Richard was formally asked to assume the crown. Affecting great reluctance he at length consented, the deputation of the citizens to his house having to wait long before they could gain admittance.

We might, to pass by the accession of Henry VII., and, later on, the effect of the citizens' apathy on the rejection of Queen Jane (Grey), dwell on the strength which was added to the throne of Elizabeth by the support of London, and on the part of the city in the deposition of Charles I., the success of the Commonwealth, and the eventual return of Charles II. But these are admitted historical facts, and have been fully detailed over and over again. One more election should be noticed at full length, and we turn, almost naturally, to the pages of Macaulay for an account of the influence of the city in bringing about the accession of William III. Strange to say, no such account can be found. Whether the great Whig historian thought the 'claims of London to a voice in the election of kings' wholly unfounded and illusory, or whether, which is improbable, he had never heard of them, it is impossible to say. But there is no mention of them; the civic authorities and their constitutional or unconstitutional part in the proceedings are but briefly described; and an interesting historical

problem is left untouched. This is the more to be deplored, because Macaulay was familiar with the name, character and reputation of the chief actors in the great drama, and could have made the narrative lifelike in a way impossible to anyone less well informed. It had, like the historical plays of Shakespeare, its tragical and its absurd aspects. The tyranny of Charles and James, the cruelty of Jeffreys, the narrow escape of Clayton, the judicial murder of Cornish, the tardy restoration of the charter, the king's flight, the illness of the newly elected Lord Mayor in the midst of the crisis —these are all events in the story, and lead up naturally to the final scenes, when the lords of the council come into the city and consult at the Guildhall with the civic fathers, and when it was resolved, for the last time in English history, to consult what seven hundred years earlier would have been termed a Witenagemote. 'Thither came all the Witan, and with them the earls and thegns that were north or south of the Thames, and the burgesses of many cities and vills, and the lithsmen of London, and they chose William to king.'

This, we may assume, would have been the account of the election of William of Orange in such a document as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. And though the result is the same, there are so many points of interest, and indeed of historical importance, which seem to be usually overlooked, that I am tempted to enumerate them as briefly as possible—but in chronological order; for it may be that the change of style, and one or two other difficulties of a similar kind, may have deterred historians, especially as the whole question arose and was decided in a very short time. It will be remembered that London,

to use the ancient phrase, had been taken into the king's hands on June 23, 1683, during the mayoralty of Sir William Pritchard, who remained in office till October 20, when the king appointed Sir Henry Tulse his successor 'during pleasure.' The whole of the arguments on the writ of 'Quo Warranto' are detailed at full length in Seymour's Stow, and need not be recapitulated here; but great use was made on the king's side of the supposed precedents afforded by the conduct of Henry III., Edward I. and Edward II. in deposing and appointing mayors and wardens. After the death of Charles II., on Friday, February 6, 1685, and the accession of James II., London was apparently at the king's mercy. The execution of Alderman Cornish has been fully described in many places; and it was said in the city that Clayton, another alderman, would have shared the fate of Cornish, but that many years before he had helped Jeffreys, then a republican lawyer, to the office of Recorder. It was one of the only three good actions which could be attributed to the chancellor that he remembered Clayton's kindness. The aldermen as well as the mayor were dismissed or appointed at the king's pleasure; and on October 29, 1687, Sir John Shorter, who was not even free of the city, and had never served any civic office, was appointed, confirmed and admitted to the mayoralty by King James. Before his year of office had expired he was killed by a fall from his horse while entering Newgate, after opening St. Bartholomew's Fair on September 4, 1688. Sir John Eyles was put into his place by the Crown, and was nominally Lord Mayor—but really Warden—when, on October 6, just a month before William of Orange

commenced his march from Torbay, the king and Jeffreys, willing, perhaps hoping, to conciliate the city, sent back the charter. This concession came too late, and the acknowledgment was so worded that James must have seen how sullenly it was received. On the usual day Sir John Chapman was chosen Lord Mayor in the place of Eyles. He was an alderman, a member of the Mercers' Company, had been Sheriff and was knighted at Whitehall in 1678, and was the son of a citizen of the same name, a grocer in Milk Street. Yet it is this prominent official that Macaulay apparently, like some other authorities, imagined was one of the aldermen appointed during the abeyance of the civic liberties. He writes of Chapman that he was 'a simple man who had passed his whole life in obscurity.'

Lord Mayor Chapman, then, was in office on December 11, 1688, when the flight of James having become known, most of the peers who were in London repaired to the Guildhall, where they were received 'with all honour by the magistracy of the city.' Archbishop Sancroft took the chair, and the day's proceedings are fully reported by many contemporary authorities. Skelton, the governor of the Tower, was summoned and brought his keys; and various other precautions were taken for the public safety. A declaration was drawn up by the lords spiritual and temporal, and despatched to the Prince; the Lord Mayor and Common Council at the same time sending a separate address, by the hands of a deputation consisting of four aldermen and eight commoners. A third document was signed on behalf of the lieutenancy of the city; the tenour of all being the same, namely, to

invite William to assume the reins of government. As far as I can make out, Macaulay does not so much as mention these first city addresses. The lords' declaration, though it committed them to a certain course of action, was by no means so thoroughgoing or open or complete an offer of the kingdom, and was not directed to the Prince in particular, like the two addresses from the citizens. In spite of the ignorance of the historian, it would seem very certain that this action on the part of London had a very decided effect on what ensued; the more so as the citizens were prepared to support their opinions with their money, as we shall see.

On the morning of December 12, after a night of terror and anxiety, the Lord Mayor took his accustomed seat on the judicial bench. The rioting of the disaffected part of the populace, the attacks on the Roman Catholics and on foreign ambassadors—these and many other cares must have weighed on his mind. Among the prisoners brought before him was Jeffreys, who had been discovered and apprehended in disguise at Wapping. There are many accounts extant of the ensuing scene. Macaulay says, in a strain of exaggeration, that at the sight of Jeffreys the agitation of the unfortunate mayor rose to the height, and that 'he fell into fits and was carried to his bed, whence he never rose.' Others have asserted that 'he immediately expired.' But it seems more than probable that Chapman's illness had but little connexion with the arrest of Jeffreys, that it was hastened by the anxieties of office and the state of public affairs, and that the coincidence of his paralytic seizure would hardly have received so much notice had

it not seemed to deprive Jeffreys of a possible defender against the vengeance of the mob.

To us, the illness of the Lord Mayor—who, indeed never rose from his bed, but died on March 17 following—is chiefly of interest because it prevented his taking that full public part in the Revolution which would, as I have endeavoured to show, have been the appropriate consequence of the city address to the Prince of Orange.

Nevertheless, two more scenes remain to be described, for though poor Chapman was only present by proxy, the place of London was fully recognised in the welcome accorded to William and in the meeting at St. James's a little later. On the news of the arrival of the Prince from the west a meeting of the aldermen and common council drew up an address, and on December 19, William having reached the palace the night before, they went in state to present it. On the 26th, again, they repaired to St. James's. A meeting of the 'witan' was summoned, if I may be permitted the expression. The prince, we are told 'being resolved not to act without the concurrence of the Lords, Commons, and citizens of London,' issued a summons to the members who had sat in parliament during the reign of Charles II., adding, 'and we do likewise desire that the Lord Mayor and court of Aldermen of the city of London would be present at the same time; and that the Common Council would appoint Fifty of their number to be there likewise. And hereof we desire them not to fail.' This invitation is summarised as follows by Macaulay,—his words are worth quoting, as showing how entirely he missed the significance of the summons:—'The Aldermen of London

were also summoned; and the Common Council was requested to send a deputation.'

The assembly met accordingly, and deliberated, with the lords, as to the future government of the kingdom, and at their request the writs were issued for the famous Convention of 1689, which was in every respect a parliament, except that it had not been summoned by royal writ.

The citizens, meanwhile, but in a more private capacity, took action for the settlement of affairs. Their zeal overstepped their discretion and drew down a rebuke from the Prince when some zealots signed a petition offering him the crown; but their opinions and wishes were more tangibly demonstrated by the loan of 200,000*l.*—an alderman, Sir Samuel Dashwood, subscribing 60,000*l.*—which was collected for William, after a unanimous vote of the common council—the whole sum being raised in forty-eight hours on the sole security of the Prince's word, where, a few weeks before, King James could obtain nothing.

I have gone at some length into this curious chapter of our history. Too much has been made of it in some quarters and too little in others, but it is plain that the great authority on the Revolution either neglected or misunderstood the part of London in the election of William III. Although, then, the influence of London was supreme, although it secured the success of the Prince of Orange, although the house of Stuart was doomed from the day Charles II. seized the charter, it by no means follows that there was then, or ever, in people's minds any idea that London could, under legal forms, put down one king and set up another, or

impose its choice on all England. But in times of confusion might is right, and the support of London, moral, financial, material, has always turned the scale. To estimate its political position, then, we must not try to draw up a legal formula; but must compare the history of the Stuart dynasty with that of the house of Hanover, or the history of the house of Lancaster with that of York, and then ask how far the issue was affected by the influence of the city.

It would be worth while, did space permit, to detail one by one the whole series of political events, apart from those connected with the election of kings, which turned upon the application of this principle. It might begin with the contests between Stephen and the Empress, where London held the balance all through, and while rejecting Matilda accepted her son. During the absence of Richard I. it was the support of the citizens—not, as some have supposed, bribed by the promise of a commune, which they had long before—that asserted the liberties of the kingdom against Longchamp. The Great Charter was obtained, and its provisions were enforced subsequently under Henry III., by London. When Edward fought in Wales or in Scotland, London supplied the money, and to London the first news of triumph was sent. The cause of Edward II. was lost when he put Lancaster, the favourite of the Londoners, to death; they supported the queen and her son, and established the throne of Edward III. The battles of the great French wars, Sluys and Cressy and Poictiers, were first won in London, as were the victories of Henry V. It was his conduct to the city that deposed Richard II., and Henry VI. might have left the crown

to his descendants had not Margaret offended, and the Duke of York propitiated, the commercial interest.

It would be easy to trace the success of Elizabeth and her great minister, Cecil, to the firm, unswerving fidelity of London which their commercial policy secured; and it would be equally easy to show that the Commonwealth became possible when Charles I. seized the money in the treasury, and that Monk's scheme for the restoration of Charles II. depended on the goodwill of London for its result. For every vicissitude of party, for every fall of a ministry, since the accession of Queen Anne, it would be easy to find a reason in the attitude of London, and to draw a parallel with some event of the earlier time. It was London which supported Pitt and which eventually defeated Buonaparte, just as it had supported William III. and had enabled Marlborough to defeat Louis. When Thomas FitzThomas spoke plainly to Henry III. as to the king's duty to his subjects, and the subjects' to their king, he anticipated the famous address by which Beckford so deeply offended George III.: 'We owe to your Majesty an obedience under the restrictions of the laws for the calling and duration of Parliaments: and your Majesty owes to us that our representation, free from the force of arms or corruption, should be preserved to us in Parliament.' London alone has been powerful enough to cherish such sentiments and express them.

It would be instructive also to compare the place of London as a capital with that of Paris, the only continental city which would bear the comparison. For London, at least since the Conquest, has been the principal city if not nominally the capital of England;

and Paris has for nearly the same time been the chief city of the French kingdom, the capitals of all other European countries having been changed over and over again in eight centuries. To make such a comparison complete would be a long and difficult task, but the student would probably sum up the result in such a judgment as this: the influence of Paris on France has usually been bad; that of London on England good. Parisians have been constantly led by caprice, and have sought selfish ends by violent means. The number of London riots, of London 'revolutions,' in the Parisian sense of the term, has been very small. Personal liberty, good government, commercial stability, freedom from arbitrary taxation have, as a rule, been the objects of the Londoners. The Parisians have talked much of these things, but have never possessed them. Such comparisons might be indefinitely pursued, but want of room has compelled me to omit many things of much greater importance to my subject.

In the foregoing pages I have endeavoured, without writing a continuous narrative, to show, first by the investigation of recently discovered evidences, how London attained its paramount position in the kingdom; secondly, how its municipal institutions, the models on which those of almost every other English city and town have been moulded, grew up from the combination of the English shire system with the foreign commune, and partakes of characteristics derived from both; thirdly, how, in spite of the legal subjection of Middlesex and part of Surrey to the city, the suburbs grew and extended under the control, not of the citizens, but of the ecclesiastical landowners and their successors. And

lastly, I have tried, in my two concluding chapters, to account for the wealth and trade of London, and to show, by two examples, taken as far apart, chronologically, as possible, the nature of London's influence on politics.

In selecting examples for detailed treatment I have endeavoured in each case to clear up obscurities, and have purposely dwelt on those questions which former writers, and I myself in another book, have been obliged to leave untouched for want of the necessary information, only now accessible. I have thought it important, in treating of the greatest city of England or the world, to establish certain facts, such as the origin of the municipality, the date of ward and parochial divisions, the significance of the grant of Middlesex, and other things of the kind, and to say more about the history of the city in itself than about the history of the city in relation to that of all England, than was intended when I first undertook to write this volume of the series. But London is so vast a subject that I had to pick and choose; for no book of this size could contain a complete account of the influence of London on England, and at the same time account for that influence. Topography, too, as distinguished from history, has necessarily been omitted as much as possible, together with architecture and personal anecdotes and the social life, and, in short, most of those things which go to make London books so entertaining. But there is much that is strange and at first sight unaccountable in London; and while the scientific historians of the present day have avoided it, people who hug theories and long traditions have had it all their own way. In breaking through the boundaries laid

down by the projector of this series I have, I hope, strengthened them in the end. My excuse must be that to write of English cities and their influence on English history it was above all things necessary to know of what parts the great and typical city consists, how and by whom those constituent elements were fitted together, and how they came to have the weight which has rendered them influential—and for the most part influential for good—in the course of the millennium which has elapsed since, to use the words of Stow, 'London having beene destroyed and brent by the Danes and other Pagan ennemeis about the yere of Christ 839, was by Alfred King of the West Saxons in the yere 886 repayred and honorably restored and made againe habitable.'

INDEX.

AARON

Aaron, 98, 99
Abingdon Abbey, 142
Abraham, 98
Achatur, 86
Acon, 40, 169
Acre, 40, 53
Acts of Parliament, 115
Adel Street, 91
Adrian, 61, 64, 87
Adulterine Guilds, 48
Ægelwine, 129
Ælfget, 126
Ælfheah (Alphege), 194
Ælfsige, 22
Æsc, 12
Æthelberht, 12, 20
Æthelred, 21, 23, 136, 176, 191, 195
Æthelred, the Alderman, 20
Æthelstan, 20, 136
Æthelstan, son of Tofig, 27
Agnes Becket, 40
Agnes, St., 81
Agodshalf (Ex parte Dei) 40, 65
Aguillon, Robert, 55
Ailwin (Ægelwine) Child, 32, 34, 36, 129
Alan, Fitz, Mayor, 55
Alban, St., 21, 91, 150
Albert Lotering, 27, 86, 128
Albus, Liber, 69
Alderman, James, 56
Alderman, Hugh, 96

ARLES

Aldermanbury, 21, 90, 91
Aldermary, 163, 167
Aldermen, 22, 45, 48, 56, 78, 104, 204, 207
Aldermen appointed by James II., 204
Aldermen, lists of, 71
Aldersgate, 27, 51, 81, 100, 144, 160
Aldgate, 11, 19, 30, 33, 81, 97, 137, 160
Aldgate, Prior of, 34
A, Letterbook, 71, 74, 86, 96
Aleyne, 72
Alfred, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 28, 150, 165, 175, 213
Algar, 27, 30, 133
Algod, 85
Alice, Martin Fitz, 96
Allectus, 9
Allen, Sir J., 106
All Hallows, 19, 161, 163–165
Alphege, St., 161, 194
Alsi, 22
Alwin Sherehog, 65
Alwold, 27, 90
Anderida, 13
Andrew, St., 75, 77, 80, 94
Anhænde, Eadmer, 182
Ansgar (Esegar), 24, 25, 27, 32, 35, 127
Arden, 93
Arles, Council of, 150

ARMOURERS
Armourers, 113
Arnald, Son of Thedmar, 59,177
Arras, 84, 87
Artillery Company, 47
Assize of Henry FitzAilwin, 38
Aswy, 63, 67, 88
Atheling Street, 91
Athulf, 54, 177
Aubrey, 179
Augusta, Roman London, 11, 12
Augustine, St., 12, 85
Augustinian Canons, 33
Aulus Plautius, 3
Aumesbury, De, 73
Aunger, 64
Austin Friars,
Auverne, Anketill, 73, 74
Axe, St. Mary, 95
Ayliff, 147
Azo, 27, 89
Azor, 27, 128

BÆDA, 136, 149, 158, 175
Bainard, 74
Baldock, a Canon, 137, 145
Balliol College, 99
Bamme, Adam, Mayor, 198
Barbican, 91
Barking, 142, 163
Barnstaple, 32
Barons' War, 54
Barrow, 133
Bars, 91, 144, 169
Bartholomew, St., 170, 204
Basing, 56, 57, 73, 79
Bat, 65, 72
Baynard's Castle, 65, 74–81
Becket, 40
Beckford, Lord Mayor, 210
Benedict the Jew, 98–100
Benedict, St. (Benet), 160, 162
Berenger, 72
Berkeley, 1
Berkhampstead, 127
Bermondsey, 146
Bethlehem Hospital, 47

BURGHERS
Billings, 83
Billingsgate, 17, 33, 83–84, 150
Birmingham, Guild at, 52
Bishops of London, 12, 21, 25, 68, 136, 137, 138, 150, 157, 160
Bishopsgate, 10, 11, 18, 29, 84–85, 92, 144
Blackfriars, 80, 93, 137
Blackthorn, 81
Blond, 64, 73, 98
Blount, Mayor, 105
Boadicea, 8
Boccointe, 72
Bock, Hugo de, 34
Bordeaux, 61
Bothaw, 174
Botolph's, St., 30, 33, 51, 159, 160
Bow Church (St. Mary), 44, 50
Box, 65, 97
Bread Street, 85
Bremen, 182
Brent, 125
Brentano, Dr., 114
Breton, Sir J., 69, 70, 97, 102, 102
Brichmar (Brihtmær), 27, 81, 129, 130
Bride, St., 144, 161, 166
Bridge, 8, 21, 23, 86
Bridge, Without, 147
Bristol, 1, 104
British London, 2, 3
British Church, 12, 150
Brito, Ralph, 28
Broad Street, 86, 98
Brocesgange, 92, 96
Bruges, 35
Buche, Hugh, 34
Buckingham, Duke of, 202
Buerse, van der, 36
Building, Assize of, 38
Bukerel, 34, 55, 56, 64
Burgh, Hubert, 137
Burghers, French and English, 25, 26

BURHRED

Burhred, 21
Bursarius, 35, 43 (66)

CADE'S REBELLION, 198
Caen, 26
Calais, 180
Camomile Street, 10, 18, 86
Candlewick Ward, 87, 109
Cannon Street, 87
Canons of St. Paul's, 137–140, 152–155
Cantelows, 154
Canterbury, 10, 13, 22, 29, 32, 40, 52, 73, 108
Cantinon, 5, 7, 8, 148
Carausius, 8
Castle Baynard, 74, 75–81
Catte, Cateaton Street, 99
Ceap-stow, 175
Celgrave, 129
Chafford, Gaddesdurie in, 132
Chamberlain, Office of, 108
Chancery Lane, 70
Change, Old, 157
Chapman, Lord Mayor, 205–207
Charlton in Middlesex, 128
Charter, Great, 55, 193, 209
Cheap, 19, 20, 40, 44, 45, 50, 60, 61, 63, 85, 87–89
Chelsea, 142
Cheney, Isabella, 55
Chertsey, 150
Chigwell, 111, 112
Chiswick, 139
Christina, Wife of Ailwin, 32
Church History, 149–172
Church Property, 122, 135–143
Clare, Earl of, 75
Clares, or Minoresses, 95
Clerk, Common, or Town, 109, 115
Cnihtengild, 30, 33
Cnut, 21, 23, 121, 173, 195
Colechurch, 86, 166
Coleman Street, 19, 27, 73, 98, 145

DOMINICIANS

Colne, 125
Common Clerk (now Town Clerk), 109, 115
Common Council, 45, 46, 114, 115, 147, 207, 208
Commune, 31
Companies and Guilds, 47, 49, 113–116, 184–187
Conservancy, Thames, 182–183
Constantine Fitz Athulf, hanged, 54, 177
Constantius, 9
Constitution of the City, 113–116
Cordwainers' Street, 51
Cornchepyng, 66
Cornhill, 16, 35, 42, 72, 89, 90, 97, 150, 167
Cornish, Alderman, 204
Cornwall, Earls of, 68, 95, 178
Coroner, Office of, 108
Corp, 65
Corsham, 195
Cosyn, 65
Coton, 65
Coventry, 52
Creganford, 12
Cresse, the Jew, 99
Cricklade, 195
Cripplegate, 27, 48, 90, 91, 144
Custom House, 183

DANEGELD, 29
Danes, 25, 26, 192, 213
Danish Saints, 166
Danish Wars, 15, 16, 20, 153, 173, 195
'Danorum, Homines,' 84
Dashwood, Alderman, 208
Dean's Lane, Old, 79
Diceto, Ralph de, Dean of St. Paul's, 41, 138
Doctors' Commons, 154
Domesday Survey, 28, 127–133, 137–143
Dominicans, 76–80

DOWGATE
Dowgate, 10, 60, 61, 92, 174
Drinchepinne, Osbert, 42
Duc, le, or Duke, 56, 72
Duceman, Roysia, 99
Dunmow, Lords of, 75
Dunstan, St., 144, 161, 165

EADGAR, 145, 194
Eadmund Ironside, 23, 194, 195
Eadric, 13, 175
Eadward, 23, 126
East Saxons, 12, 13, 15, 136
Easterling, 26, 176
'Ealdgate,' 82
Ealdstreet, 82
Edmund, St., 163
Edred's Hithe, 95
Edward I., 63, 65, 68, 74, 97, 100, 105, 181, 182, 209
Edward II., 70, 102, 105, 107, 110–112, 181, 192, 209
Edward III., 104, 105, 112, 113, 117, 179, 181, 209
Edward IV., 115, 193, 200
Edward the Confessor, 25, 28, 30, 128–131, 135
Edward de Sarisberie, 142
Edward Hup-Cornhill, 42, 90
Edward 'le Fitz Roy,' 58, 59
Edwardus cum barba, 65
Eilward Fitz Wizel, 36
Elias the Jew, 99
Elizabeth, 181, 183, 210
Erkenwald, St., 150, 152, 157, 159, 160
Ermin Street, 4, 19
Esegar, or Ansgar, 24, 25, 27, 32, 35, 127
Essex, 14
Ethelburga, St., 159, 163,
Exchange, 66
Exchequer Rolls, 47–49
Eyles, Mayor, 204

FARM, or Ferm of a City, 52
— of Middlesex, 28, 43, 121–125

GILBERT
Farm of Southwark, 112
Farringdon, 73, 74, 145
Fitz, 177
Fitz Ailwin, 36, 43
Fitz Lefstan, 39
Fitz Osbert, 43
Fitz Stephen, 38
Fitz Thomas, 57–61, 210
Fitz Walter, 74–80
Fitz Ysabel, 39
Fleet, 76, 166
Foreign Settlers, 26–28
Forts, Roman and British, 2, 3
Foster, or St. Vedast's Lane, 92
Frankish Mercenaries, 9
Freeman, Mr., quoted, 193
Frenchmen in London, 25, 176
Friars, Augustinian, or Austin, 168
— Black, or Dominican, or Preachers, 76, 80, 137
— Grey, or Franciscan, 19, 168
— of the Sack, 100
— White, or Carmelite, 137, 168
Frithguild, 53
Fromund, 177

GABRIEL, St., 164
Gallois, Henry le, 178
Garlickhithe, 50, 51
Gaufridus Bursarius, 35, 43
Geoffrey, 'atte Condytt,' 72
Geoffrey Bursar, 35, 43
Geoffrey Mandeville, 37
Geoffrey, Son of Bainard, 74
Geoffrey, Son of Wlured, 27
George I., 115
George, St., 48
Germans, 26, 176, 178
Gilbert Becket, 40
Gilbert Prudfot, or Proudfoot, 86
Gilbert, Son of Tursten, 78
Gilbert, Son of Wlveva, 78

GILDHALDA

Gildhalda Theutonicorum, 26, 177
Giles, St., Cripplegate, 10, 162, 170
Giraldus on Guildhall, 32
Glanville, 53
Gloucester, Duke of, 80, 200
Gloucester, Earl of, 37
Godwin, Earl, 25
Godwin, Son of Ausgar, 27
Goldingswell, 91
Good Cheap, 65
Good Christian, 65
Good Soul, 65
Gos, 65
Gosfrith, Portreeve, 25
Government, early, 13–15, 117–119
Gower, 169
Grant of Middlesex, 121–125
Gravesend, 182, 183
Great Charter, 55, 56, 192, 209
Great Fire of 1136, 37
Great Fire of 1666, 171
Gregory Rokesley, 60–63, 64, 66, 67, 76, 109
Gregory, St., 80, 154, 155
Green, Mr., 179, 191
Greenwich, 182
Grey Friars, 19, 168
Guest, Dr., on Site of London, 3
Guest, Dr., on Watling Street, 6
Guildhall, 21, 25, 31, 65, 71, 83, 91, 107, 110, 185
Guilds, 48–54, 113, 114
Guthorm-Æthelstan, 20
Gutter Lane, 20, 91
Gyddesdune, 132

HACON, 27, 86, 98
Hadstock, 96
Hakeneye, 27, 189
Haliwell, or Holywell, 48, 140, 145
Hansa, 84
Hanworth, 126

JAMES

Harold, 21, 196, 197
Harthacnut, 21, 24
Hatton, 128
Haverell, 48
Hearding, 130
Helen, St., 150, 163, 169
Hengest, 12
Henry I., 28–30, 35, 197
Henry II., 38, 42, 53
Henry III., 57–60, 95, 108, 194
Henry V., 199, 209
Henry VI., 192, 199
Henry VII., 107, 202
Henry of Huntingdon, 176
Henry of Londonstone, the first Mayor, 36, 38, 39, 43, 55, 129
Herbert's *Livery Companies*, errors in, 114, 115, 186
Hertfordshire, 125, 151, 174
Hervey, Walter, 54, 60–63, 64, 88, 115, 184
Highbury, 133
Hillingdon, 126
Hlothhære, 13, 22, 175
Holborn, 94, 139
Holy Trinity, Aldgate, 33, 155
Hornsey, 137
Hoxton, 139, 140
Hubert, Archbishop, 44
Hubert de Burgh, 137
Huberti, Porta, 93
Hugo cum dentibus, 65
Hugo, Alderman, 96
Hulbold, 27
Hulles, 40
Hup-Cornhill, 35, 90
Hustings, 24

IRONMONGER LANE, 50
Islington, 131, 133 139

JACOB, the Alderman, 56
James I., 92
James II. 203–205, 208

JANE

Jane, Queen, 202
Jeffreys, 204–206
Jewry, Old, 98, 166
Jews' Burial Place, 100
Jews' Houses, 98–100
Jews' Synagogue, 100
John, 43, 49
Joce Fitz Peter, 93, 94
Joyner, 57
Jukill, Alderman, 90
Juvenal, Thomas, 109

KATHARINE, St., 155, 161, 164, 170
Kemble quoted, 126
Kenred of Mercia, 136
Kensington, 142
Kentish Town, 134, 154
Kilwardby, Archbishop, 76, 93
Kinegif, Wife of Ulf, 126
Kings elected in London, 191–209
King's Manor, 146
Kirkeby, 67
Knightenguild (*see* Cnihtengild), 30–33, 35
Knightrider Street, 67

LAFEITE, 48
Lancaster, Thomas, Earl of, 111
Langbourn, 74, 94
Langford, 74, 94
Laud, Archbishop, 170, 172
Law Courts, New, 108
Lazarus, St., Guild of, 48
Lea, Valley of the, 125
Leadenhall, 95
Leeds Castle, Kent, 111
Leo, a Jew, 99
Leofred, 131
Leofric, 128
Leofstan, 22, 32, 39, 126, 129
Leofwine, Earl, 126, 128
Letterbooks at Guildhall, 71, 74, 97, 111

MATILDA

Leuricus, 78
Leyre, W. de, 109
Liberty Manor, 146
Lime Street, 95
Lincoln, 98
Linen Armourers, 113
Lists of Wards, 72–97
Lithsmen, 24, 196, 197
Livery Companies, 114, 115, 186, 187
Lombard Bankers, 110, 111
London, Modern, founded by Alfred, 16, 213
London Bridge, 86
London, Exchange of, 65
London, Roman, 1–12
London, Saxon, 12, 13
London Stone, 36, 43, 55, 168
London Wic, 13
Longbeard, William Fitz Osbert, 42–46
Longchamp, William, Bishop of Ely, 42, 90
Lord Mayor, Title of, 105–107
Lorraine, Upper and Lower, 176
Lotharingians, 128, 129
Lothbury, 27, 74, 84, 86, 87, 100, 128, 129
Lucius, King, 16, 164
Ludgate, 21, 46, 92, 144
Luke, St., Old Street, 82
Lundenbrige, 21
Lyfing, Archbishop, 23, 195
Lyte, Mr. Maxwell, quoted, 22, 116

MACAULAY, 202–208
Malet, William, 96
Malmesbury, William of, 53
Mapesbury, 139
Margaret, St., 129
Martin, St., 92
Matilda, Queen, 33
Matilda, the Empress, 36, 37, 209

MAYOR

Mayor, Mayoralty, 38–40, 41–46, 71, 81, 104–108, 205–207
Mayor, Peter Fitz, 55
Mary Aldermary, St., 163
Mary Colchurch, St., 166
Mary le Bow, St., 163
Mary Magdalen, St., 159
Mary of Graces, St., 169
Medway, 182
Mellitus, 12
Mercers, 50
Mercers' Chapel, 40
Merchant Taylors, 113
Middle Saxons, 13, 136, 151
Middlesex, 28, 121–128, 130, 134–145, 153, 212
Milk Street, 58, 100, 159
Millbank, 140
Minoresses (*see* Clares), 169
Monk, General, 210
Monkswell, 9
Montfitchett, 76
Montfort, Simon de, 58–60, 68, 194
Moorfields, 139, 140
Mortimer, Earl of March, 111, 112
Municipality, 43, 102, 116
Muntford, Sim' of, 64

NEASTON, 139
Newgate, 7, 10, 19
Newington, 6
New Weir, 182
Nore, 182
Norman Conquest, 24, 193
Norman, Prior of Aldgate, 33
Northumbria, King of, 13

OLAVE, St., 166
Old Change, 50, 157
Old Ford, 11
Old Gate, 82
Old Jewry, 100
Orange, William of, 193, 203

ROGERS

Orgar, or Ordgar, 33–36, 42, 156, 159, 160
Osbert, Drinchepinne, 42
Osyth, St., 159, 160
Oxford, 32, 131, 197
Oxford Street, 140

PARIS AND LONDON, 210, 211
Park Lane, 6
Parliament, City Members, 58
Parliament at Stepney, 105
Paul's, St., 15, 19, 41, 44, 79, 80, 88, 125, 134–140, 141, 149, 151–158, 162, 170
Pepys, Samuel. 169, 183
Peter, St., in Cheap, 63
Peter, St., upon Cornhill, 16, 164
Peter, St., Westminster, 145
Plague (Black Death), 180
Plautius, Aulus, 3
Port, 182, 183
Portmannimote, 24
Portmeadow, 29
Portreeve, 22–25, 29, 32, 34, 39
Portsoken, 33, 34, 73, 95
Posterns, 91, 94
Precinct of St. Paul's, 79, 80, 88
Prutfot, Gilbert, 29, 86
Ptolemy, 4–6, 148

QUEENHITHE, 95
Quo Warranto, 204

RALPH OF COGGESHALE, 98
Reciprocity in Trade, 179
Reimund, Reinmund, 89
Renger, or Fitz Reiner, 42, 56, 90
Restitutus, Bishop, 150
Richard, Earl of Cornwall, 178
Richard I., 38, 41
Rogers, Mr., 192

ROKESLEY

Rokesley, Gregory, Mayor, 60, 61, 62–67, 109
Roman London, 3–5, 7–12, 18, 19, 118
Romans, Richard, King of the, 178
Romelands, 19
Roses, Wars of, 198
Rufus, William, 30
Rugmere, 139, 141, 154
Runnymede, 55
Russell, 89

SÆBERHT, King, 12
Sandwich, Warden, 67–101
Sarisberie, 142
Saxons, Middle and East, 12, 13, 136
Sebbi, King, 151
Serlo, Serle, Mayor, 56
Settlements, Early, 18, 176
Sharpe, Dr., on Trade, 179
Shaw, Dr., 201
Sherehog, 159
Shorter, Sir J., 204
Simon, Earl (*see* Montfort), 54 57, 58, 59
Sired, a Canon, 30
Size Lane, 159
Slaves, 139, 153
Sluys, Battle of, 209
Smith, Sydney, Canon, 139
Southwark, 5, 23, 57, 99, 112, 146
Sperling, 27, 84
Sprot, 27
Stagiaries, 154
Stephen, 36, 191, 192, 193, 209
Stepney, 151
Stigand, Archbishop, 128
Stow, John, the Historian, 30, 34, 90, 213
Stuart Dynasty, 208
Suæbred, King, 136
Suetonius, 8, 120
Swegn, Sheriff, 132

WALLACE

Swetman, 22, 130
Swithin, St., 36
Synagogue, 100

TACITUS, 120
Taylor, Philip, 61, 64, 84, 85
Taylors, Merchant, 113
Telarii, 49
Temple Bar, 144
Tewkesbury, 200
Thames, 1, 3, 165, 174, 175, 181–183, 196
Thedmar, 177
Theutonicorum, Gildhalda, 26, 177
Thomas, St., of Canterbury, 40
Thomas Fitz Thomas, Mayor, 54, 57–61, 62, 68, 194, 210
Thorney Island, 6
Thovy, 27, 66
Tilbury, 183
Tofig the Proud, 27
Tooley Street, 166
Tothill Fields, 6
Tower, The, 28, 67, 173, 199
Tower Hill, 169
Tower, Ward of, 96
Tursten, Alderman, 78–80
Tyler, Wat, 184, 198

ULF, 24, 126, 127
Ulf, Son of Mann, 128
Ulgarus, 22, 27

VEDAST, St., 92, 162
Verli, de, 77
Vienne, Hugh de, 99
Vintry, Ward of, 96

WALEYS, WALLENSIS, 61, 62, 104, 105, 178
Wall, London, 9, 23
Wallace's Rebellion, 110

WATTON

Watton in Middlesex, 131
Wallbrook, 3, 11, 36, 64, 65, 70, 73, 96, 174
Wallworth, 5
Wards, 18, 73–97
Warwick Lane, 79
Watling Street, 4, 6, 7, 11, 80, 158
Weavers, 48
Weir, New, 182
Weser, 182
Westgate, 21
Westminster, 23, 58, 140, 161
White Chapel, 135
Whittington, 55
Wickreeve, 13, 22
Wihtred, 175
Willesden, 139
William I., 25, 130, 132, 135, 176
William III., 193, 202–208, 210
William, Bishop of London, 25, 132
William Longbeard, 42–44
William, Son of Derman, 131
Winchester, 104, 193
Windsor, 60, 139
Wizel, Fitz, 36
Wluardus, 34
Wlured, 27
Wlveva, 78
Wolfegare, 22, 126
Wood Street,
Wren, Sir C., 170, 172
Wulfran, 27

YORK, 105

ZACHARY, 156, 159, 162
Zuyder Zee, 26

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

00084714

Digitized with financial assistance from

H T Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 15 October, 2018